Foreign
Broadcast
Information
Service
50
ANNIVERSARY
1941 - 1991

Daily Report

Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-91-098
Tuesday
21 May 1991

Daily Report
Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-91-098 — CONTENTS — *21 May 1991*

NOTICE TO READERS: On 6 May 1991, the DAILY REPORT will begin phasing in new radio and television sourcelines that reflect how a station identifies itself. This change eliminates the "Domestic Service" and "Television Service" designations in favor of the station identification as broadcast. The presence of a new sourceline reflects this change in policy, rather than the establishment of a new station or network.

NOTICE TO READERS: An * indicates material not disseminated in electronic form.

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

Arms Talks With U.S. Begin in Washington *[TASS]* 1
  Commentary on Moiseyev Talks *[Moscow International]* 1
Chief Delegate Says Vienna Talks 'Marking Time' *[PRAVDA 21 May]* 1
U.S. Congressional Committee Cut in SDI Noted *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 18 May]* 2

WORLDWIDE ISSUES

Gorbachev Greets Asian-Pacific Conference *[TASS]* 3
IZVESTIYA Probe of KAL Flight Continues *[IZVESTIYA 16 May]* 3
  Third Installment of Part Two *[IZVESTIYA 17 May]* 7
Shevardnadze's 'Private Diplomacy' Analyzed *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 18 May]* 9
Possible G-7 Role in Crisis Recovery Foreseen *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 18 May]* 11
Conference To Discuss Human Rights Worldwide *[INTERFAX]* 11

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

United States & Canada

Moscow Denies Paper's Charge of Missile in Cuba *[PRAVDA]* 13
  Fitzwater Refutes Article *[TASS]* 13
Bush's 'New World Order' Seen as 'Old' Idea *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 17 May]* 13
Politics of U.S., World Aid to USSR Viewed *[IZVESTIYA 18 May]* 15

China

Jiang Zemin Visits Leningrad *[TASS]* 15
  Meets Leningrad Mayor *[TASS]* 15
  Meets Leningrad Party Secretary *[PRAVDA 20 May]* 16
  Departs for PRC *[TASS]* 16
Sino-Soviet Communique Issued After Jiang Visit *[PRAVDA 20 May]* 16
IZVESTIYA Reports Jiang-Pavlov Talks *[18 May]* 19
Commentaries View Results of Jiang Zemin Visit 20
  'New Model' of Relations Established *[PRAVDA 20 May]* 20
  'Enormous Potential' for Improved Ties *[Moscow International]* 21
  Meeting Stresses Domestic Stability *[Moscow International]* 21
  Sino-Soviet 'Horizons' Expanded *[Moscow International]* 22
  USSR-PRC 'Learning From Each Other' *[INTERFAX]* 22
  U.S.'Two China' Policy Denounced *[Moscow International]* 23

Northeast Asia

Deputies, ROK Legislators Discuss Bilateral Ties *[IZVESTIYA 15 May]* 23
Pardoned DPRK 'Hijacker' Interviewed *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 17 May]* 24
Japanese To Visit Relatives' Graves in USSR *[INTERFAX]* 25

Near East & South Asia

Bessmertnykh Comments on Recent Mideast Tour *[Moscow TV]* 25
  Views Peace Prospects *[IAN]* 26
  INTERFAX Commentary *[INTERFAX]* 27
  TASS Analyst Views Tour *[TASS]* 27
  Hopes for Peace 'Gradually Increasing' *[Moscow International]* 28
Nishanov Delegation Ends Visit to Libya, Egypt *[IZVESTIYA 20 May]* 28
  Comments on Egypt Visit *[Moscow TV]* 29
U.S. Seen Edging Away From Aid to Mujahidin *[PRAVDA 15 May]* 29

West Europe

Gorbachev Meets Portuguese President Soares *[TASS]* 29
Kohl Seeking 'Short' Meeting With Gorbachev *[TASS]* 30
Germany Withdrawal Agreement Enters Into Force *[IZVESTIYA 18 May]* 30
Troop Pullout Campaign 'Launched' by FRG Press *[Moscow International]* 30
Economic Consequences of German Unification Viewed *[TASS]* 31
Forthcoming Visit by Italy's Andreotti Previewed *[TASS]* 31

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Supreme Soviet

New Emigration Law To Be Implemented 1 Jan 93 *[Moscow Radio]* 32
Sanctions Against Wildcat Strikes Stiffened *[TASS]* 32
Appointments Named During Supreme Soviet Session *[PRAVDA 17 May]* 32
Supreme Soviet 20 May Session Reviewed *[Moscow TV]* 33

Political & Social

Air Traffic Controller Strike Postponed to 10 Aug *[Radio Rossii]* 34
Gorbachev Moscow Science Conference Address Cited *[TASS]* 34
Birthday of Late Academician Sakharov Commemorated 34
  Moscow Street To Be Renamed *[Moscow Radio]* 34
  Rally Becomes Political Protest *[Russian TV]* 35
Shevardnadze Suggests UN Role To Ease USSR Strife *[PRAVDA 20 May]* 35
Shevardnadze Calls for 'Resolute Action' *[INTERFAX]* 35
CPSU's Luchinskiy Meets Moscow Students' Aktiv *[PRAVDA 17 May]* 36
Luchinskiy, Others Address Party Editors' Course *[PRAVDA 20 May]* 36
Gorbachev Aide Yakovlev on Right-Wing Threat *[LA REPUBBLICA 12-13 May]* 36
Nazarbayev Interviewed in Moscow on New Book 38
  Expresses Support for Gorbachev *[Moscow Radio]* 38
  Called 'Brightest' Political Figure *[Moscow International]* 38
Statesmen's 'Defense-Consciousness' Questioned *[IZVESTIYA 17 May]* 38
Alksnis Rebuts Soyuz 'Coup' Item, Author Responds *[IZVESTIYA 15 May]* 41
Party Must Come to Terms With Perestroyka *[PRAVDA 13 May]* 43
Results of Poll on Obstacles to Democratization *[IZVESTIYA 13 May]* 45
Army, Church Head Popularity Poll *[Moscow TV]* 46
MVD People's Deputies Form Policeman's Club *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 16 May]* 47
Interior Ministry on Victims of Ethnic Conflicts *[TASS]* 47
'Informal Groups' Blamed for 1989 Tbilisi Violence *[INTERFAX]* 47
Heir to Throne 'Prepared To Serve Russia' *[IZVESTIYA 14 May]* 48
USSR: Deputy Premier on Drop in Food Production *[TASS]* 48
Yakutsk Secures More Food From Central Government *[INTERFAX]* 48
Muscovites Polled on Recent Price Increases *[TASS]* 49
Flow of State Goods to Black Market Increases *[Moscow TV]* 49
Interior Ministry Says Economic Crimes Increasing *[INTERFAX]* 49
State Property Foundation Chairman Appointed *[PRAVDA 16 May]* 49
Death Figures Among Chernobyl Workers Disputed *[TASS]* 49
May Holidays Disrupt Industry, Services *[RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA 15 May]* 50

TASS Reviews Soviet Central Press ... 50
  18 May ... 50
  20 May PRAVDA ... 51
  21 May ... 51

Economic

Filshin Appointed Deputy Foreign Trade Minister *[Moscow International]* ... 52
Fuel Oil Shortage Blamed on Waste, Misuse *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 15 May]* ... 52
Central Committee Commission Views Problems *[Moscow Radio]* ... 53
Ministry Hosts Oil, Gas Industry Conference *[PRAVDA 18 May]* ... 53
Group Urges Liberalization in Joint Ventures *[INTERFAX]* ... 53
Large Natural Gas Field Discovered *[TASS]* ... 54
Abalkin Discusses Three Stages of Economic Reform *[Seoul THE KOREA HERALD 21 May]* ... 54
Prominent Economists View Current Developments *[Paris BUSINESS IN THE USSR No. 12]* ... 55

Agricultural

Lukyanov Warns Against Agriculture 'Monopolists' *[Moscow TV]* ... 57
Stroyev Chairs CPSU Agrarian Commission Talks *[PRAVDA 17 May]* ... 57
  Visits Stavropol, Meets Boldyrev *[SELSKAYA ZHIZN 16 May]* ... 57
Agriculture Minister Discusses Spring Field Work *[Moscow TV]* ... 58
  Notes Various Problems *[Moscow TV]* ... 59
RSFSR Commission on Party Role in Reform *[SELSKAYA ZHIZN 14 May]* ... 59
Problems in Potato-Growing Sector Reported *[PRAVDA 15 May]* ... 60
Rostov Harvester Builders Hit by Shortages *[Moscow TV]* ... 60
Progress, Problems in Spring Sowing Reported *[Moscow Radio]* ... 61
Agricultural Developments for 9-15 May Reported *[Alma-Ata Radio, etc.]* ... 61

Scientific

Soyuz Spacecraft Docks With Mir Complex *[TASS]* ... 61
  Gorbachev Speaks With Cosmonauts *[Moscow Radio]* ... 62
  Sees Boost in UK-USSR Cooperation *[TASS]* ... 63
Modified Shuttle Starts Ground Tests at Baykonur *[Moscow TV]* ... 63
Space Agency Congress Outlines 1992 Agenda *[TASS]* ... 63
Serial Shows Previously Classified Space Archives *[TASS]* ... 63

Military

Yazov Issues Orders on Armed Forces Reduction *[Radio Rossii]* ... 64
All-Army Party Bureau Endorses Ryzhkov *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 17 May]* ... 64
Army Aide on Candidate for RSFSR Presidency *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 16 May]* ... 64
Shchit Claim of Anti-Yeltsin Crusade Rebutted *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 18 May]* ... 64
Military Lessons of Gulf War Analyzed *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 17 May]* ... 65

REGIONAL AFFAIRS

Baltic Republics

Estonia's Savisaar on Foreign Economic Links *[Tallinn Radio]* ... 68
Latvian-Soviet Talks 'Postponed' Until June *[TASS]* ... 68
  Soviet Comments on Delay *[TASS]* ... 68
Lithuania Proposes Economic Accord With Moscow *[Radio Vilnius]* ... 68
Belorussian-Lithuanian Border Incidents Reported ... 69
  Casualties Cited *[IZVESTIYA 21 May]* ... 69
  Lithuanian, Belorussian Premiers Comment *[Radio Vilnius]* ... 69
  No Decline in Relations Cited *[Radio Vilnius]* ... 70
  Buildings Burned *[Radio Vilnius]* ... 70

  Custom Checkpoints Burned *[BALTFAX]* 70
Vilnius Personnel Not To Take Part in Air Strike *[BALTFAX]* 71
Lithuanian Interior Minister Interviewed *[Radio Vilnius]* 71
Lithuania 'Agitated' at Rising Prices *[Radio Vilnius]* 71

RSFSR

Congress of People's Deputies Opens 21 May *[Moscow TV]* 72
  Yeltsin Gives Opening Remarks *[Moscow TV]* 74
Yeltsin Meets Agricultural Specialists on Crisis *[TASS]* 75
Yeltsin Decree Makes Leningrad Free Economic Zone *[Moscow World Service]* 76
Yeltsin, Ryzhkov on Presidential Election *[TASS]* 76
Commentary Examines Presidential Candidates *[Moscow International]* 76
Report on Russian Presidential Candidates *[Moscow Radio]* 77
Rutskoy Introduces 'Civic Consensus' Body *[TASS]* 77
Investigation of Democratic Russia Explosion Cited *[Radio Rossii]* 78
Popov Explains Misgivings Over Mayoral Elections *[IZVESTIYA 20 May]* 78
  Discusses Moscow Mayor Issues *[Moscow TV]* 79
  Moscow Soviet Refuses Candidacy *[Radio Rossii]* 81
Provisions of RSFSR Land Code Summarized *[IZVESTIYA 20 May]* 81

Western Republics

Belorussian Strike Deadline Expires 21 May *[IZVESTIYA 20 May]* 81
  Minsk Workers Hold Warning Strike *[INTERFAX]* 82
Production Slumps in Belorussia, Measures Cited *[Minsk Radio]* 82
Kravchuk Views Problems Facing Union Treaty *[Berlin ADN]* 83
Ukrainian Supreme Soviet Debates Sovereignty Law *[Kiev International]* 83
New Ukraine Constitution Discussed *[Kiev International]* 84
Ukraine Democratic Press Association Established *[Kiev International]* 85
Moldovan President on National Reconciliation *[TASS]* 85
Moldovan Legislators Open Candidacy Discussions *[TASS]* 85
Moldova Examines Government Structure *[TASS]* 85
New Autonomy Proposed in Moldova for Gagazis *[INTERFAX]* 86

Caucasus

Gamsakhurdia Interviewed; Assails Shevardnadze *[EKHO LITVY 3 May]* 86
Girenko Visits S. Ossetia, Holds Talks *[PRAVDA 20 May]* 87
Ter-Petrosyan: Gorbachev Not Keeping His Word *[Madrid DIARIO 16 17 May]* 87
Armenian Supreme Soviet Appeals on Deportees *[Yerevan Radio]* 88
Television Shows Events in Nagorno-Karabakh *[Moscow TV]* 89

Central Asia

Russia's Silayev on Ties With Kazakhstan *[Radio Rossii]* 89
Kazakh Deputies Criticize Government Policies *[Moscow Radio]* 90
CPSU's Shenin Tours Uzbekistan 15-18 May *[PRAVDA 17 May]* 90
  Uzbek Policies 'Inspire Confidence' *[TASS]* 90

Arms Talks With U.S. Begin in Washington

LD2005172991 Moscow TASS in English 1709 GMT 20 May 91

[By TASS correspondent Stanislav Lunev]

[Text] Washington May 20 TASS—Soviet-American talks on arms control began at the U.S. State Department this morning.

The Soviet delegation at the talks is led by chief of Soviet General Staff Mikhail Moiseyev. The delegation includes Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister Yuliy Kvitsinskiy and representatives of the Soviet Foreign and Defence Ministries.

The American side at the talks is led by U.S. Under Secretary of State for Security Assistance, Science and Technology Reginald Bartholomew.

Commentary on Moiseyev Talks

LD2005140491 Moscow Radio Moscow World Service in English 1210 GMT 20 May 91

[Yuriy Solton commentary]

[Text] A Soviet delegation headed by Chief of the General Staff of the Soviet Armed Forces Army General Mikhail Moiseyev has arrived in Washington to hold negotiations with high-ranking Washington officials engaged in disarmament control. Here is more from Yuriy Solton:

The Soviet delegation has been assigned a mission to find a mutually acceptable solution to disputes arising from (?various) interpretation of the Conventional Forces in Europe treaty signed last November in Paris by the leaders of 22 countries. The United States and several other participants blame the Soviet Union for not having been honest in transferring three mobile infantry divisions under Coast Guard control and thus saving a part of military hardware subject to destruction. The Soviet military officials deny that the treaty was violated. And I do not doubt this, writes Yuriy Solton.

But besides the formal side there is still another which is no less important. It is impossible to resolve complicated disarmament problems without confidence. And this is the point where mutual claims (?emerge). The situation needs to be rectified, and not only Moscow thinks so. The commander of the NATO forces in Europe, U.S. General John Galvin, believes that with a treaty coming into force a large-scale Soviet attack on Europe will no longer be possible. And to add that the ratification of the treaty will open the way to other pressing agreements on disarmament, in the first place on the reduction of strategic offensive weapons. [sentence as heard]

The American press has announced with a reference to Soviet military sources that the Soviet Union is ready to make concessions and change its position in order to find the way out of the impasse, adding that General Moiseyev came to Washington with concrete proposals. The question is, however, a sensitive one and it is not to be speculated on. Not only security but the prestige of either side is at stake.

The only thing I can say, continues Yuriy Solton, is that Moscow is ready to seek compromise decisions which could prevent the countries, participants in the treaty, from finding any loopholes to bypass it. If the American side shows the same readiness, there won't be any special problems. And to remind that talking over the telephone recently Mikhail Gorbachev and President Bush expressed mutual desire for speedy comprehensive solution of disarmament issues. Of course, it does not fully predetermine the success of upcoming negotiations, but it is encouraging and optimistic.

Chief Delegate Says Vienna Talks 'Marking Time'

PM2105105391 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 21 May 91 Second Edition p 5

[Report by correspondent I. Melnikov: "No Change in Vienna. Delegations From 34 Countries Take a Time-Out"]

[Text] Vienna saw off the talks participants with continuous cold rain as they dispersed for the brief May break. One of my journalist colleagues could not resist a black joke: "The sky is lamenting the failures in the Hofburg." Although this judgment is somewhat extreme, the fact remains that the round of talks the 22 states are conducting on conventional armaments in Europe, which has gone on for a month, has not resolved the controversial questions on the agenda.

So how are things going at the confidence-building and security measures talks being held among all 34 states that participated in the all-European conference? Not so badly, at first glance. There has been progress there in four areas.

Above all there was the first exchange of information on military forces and plans for the deployment of armaments and hardware. The experts described it as a key element, a significant advance toward a totally new level of openness. The second task—creation of a CSCE communications network— is nearing fulfillment. Its technical readiness could be established this very year—although it will be necessary, before all the capitals of the states participating in the all-European process are firmly linked up, to agree on the question of payment for the transmission of information.

Another question studied at the spring session was preparation for a second seminar on military doctrines. Finally, another gain for the current session was the the formation of a new all-European institution—the Conflict Prevention Center—which is taking place before our eyes. As expected, there was interesting, substantive discussion at its consultative committee.

In view of all this, one might expect a sense of satisfaction. But no: USSR delegation head Oleg Grinevskiy is critical.

"I am far, very far, from euphoric," he said in conversation with me. "The talks as a whole are marking time. Let us look at the fundamental tasks. You find measures of a limited nature. The Soviet delegation has submitted specific parameters on the limitation of military activity, but the partners remain silent. They appear to have forgotten that previously they proposed transferring to the talks among the 34 a number of stabilization measures which were under examination at the talks among the 22. But can confidence-building measures on naval and air forces really remain outside the sphere of openness?

But perhaps the main reason for concern, O. Grinevskiy said in conclusion, is the fact that there have been no new, far-reaching proposals—to fit the conclusion [as published] that is taking shape in Europe at the moment. It may sound harsh, but what we are seeing in the resplendent Hofburg today are scraps from the tables of the Stockholm and previous Vienna talks. There are practically no new ideas. Moreover, when the conversation gets around to the elaboration of a mandate for future talks, which are to start after "Helsinki-2," some of our colleagues are racked by doubts. It appears that they are still unable to choose whether to continue to rely on force in politics or to opt for cooperative security.

U.S. Congressional Committee Cut in SDI Noted

PM2105100591 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 18 May 91 First Edition p 2

["Own Information" report: "Knife in the Back for SDI?"]

[Text] The U.S. Congress is continuing to discuss the draft federal budget. The other day the House Armed Services Committee approved the allocation of $291 billion to the Pentagon for fiscal 1992. This is $4.2 billion less than the administration had asked for.

It is first and foremost the appropriations envisioned by the administration for the implementation of SDI that are being cut—and very substantially. The committee agreed to allocate just $2.7 billion for this program instead of the $4.58 billion that had been requested. The committee also decided not to release funds for the coming year for the development [sozdaniye] of the Brilliant Pebbles component of the SDI system. At the same time, the congressmen agreed to grant the Defense Department the $1.6 billion it had requested for the research program associated with the future construction of 75 B-2 stealth bombers. Almost all conventional arms development programs were approved too.

The committee vote caused great concern at the Pentagon, and G.Cooper, director of the SDI Organization, called it a "knife in the back for SDI."

Gorbachev Greets Asian-Pacific Conference

LD2005113191 Moscow TASS in English 1107 GMT 20 May 91

[By TASS diplomatic correspondent Andrey Pershin]

[Text] Moscow May 20 TASS—The international conference "On Peace and Security in the Northeastern Part of the Asian-Pacific Region—a Glance Into the 21st Century" opened here today.

It will discuss ways to turn the Asian-Pacific region into a zone of lasting peace, good-neighbourly relations and extensive cooperation, as well as the role of science in this vitally important process. The agenda also includes problems of economic and humanitarian cooperation in the region.

The conference was organised by the Soviet Scientists for Global Security committee jointly with the USSR Academy of Sciences, Moscow State University, the Academy of National Economy and the Committee of Youth Organisations of the USSR. It is being attended by some 100 prominent public leaders, scholars and experts from China, South Korea, Mongolia, the USSR, the United States and Japan.

A message to the conference from President Mikhail Gorbachev was read out at the opening session.

IZVESTIYA Probe of KAL Flight Continues

91UF0747A Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 16 May 91 Union Edition p 5

["IZVESTIYA Investigation. Part Two" by Aleksandr Shalnev, IZVESTIYA correspondent in New York, and Andrey Illesh: "Secret of the Korean Boeing-747"]

[Text]

II.

In many respects, optimism feeds on naivete. But the naivete is not immediately recognizable.

I too was overly hasty in expressing, in one of the materials of the previous series of IZVESTIYA investigations, a hope—bordering on conviction—that the business of uncovering the mystery of the Boeing would move now forward faster. That Congress would have its say; that the American press, which had proven many times before that it could handle almost any mystery, both domestic and foreign, would stir itself into action.

None of this happened. There is emptiness, silence, and deafening tranquillity.

There is silence in Congress, too, although it had been assumed that there would be some movement: After all, it was Congress that all these years had kept the interest in the tragedy over Sakhalin alive. I inquired at Capitol Hill: What is up here? "There is no investigation," I was told. "Many questions still do not have answers. We will call you if we have anything new." No calls.

At the Association of Families of KAL-007 Victims I was given a very rational, from my point of view, explanation, presented in a typically American practical manner, as to why Congress—where initially there was great interest in what IZVESTIYA might say (IZVESTIYA materials, translated by the CIA publishing service, had been distributed, according to my data, among a great number of legislators, including two-thirds of the senators)—why this interest nevertheless never translated into specific measures and steps. "An investigation is an expensive undertaking; it requires a lot of money and the involvement of considerable human resources. If there is an opportunity to obtain the information through less costly channels, they will follow that avenue." It appears that the people on the Capitol Hill hope that part of the investigation, which, ideally, should have been conducted by Congress itself, will be done for them by IZVESTIYA.

Still, there is some progress! First, as we have already reported, it was the State Department that gave the order to the CIA to translate and publish the IZVESTIYA articles. Second, there is a rumor that in the future the Department of Transportation will be prepared to publish some documents related to how the search for the downed plane had been conducted.

And, third, the U.S. deputy chief of mission in Moscow (I am using American terminology) visited the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. According to the State Department information, which was made available to me, he discussed the Boeing affair there and received the following reply (I quote):

"We do not have any additional information on the KAL-007... The IZVESTIYA articles do not represent official information, and statements contained in them are considered to be unsupportable. The official position of the Soviet Union remains the same: The matter is closed... If we have any new information, we will let you know."

I have a suspicion that although the State Department officials and other functionaries in the U.S. Administration are still bringing up, and will continue to bring up, the Boeing affair at various levels of their communications with Soviet bureaucrats, it appears that Washington would also like to consider this matter closed. They are coming back to it only because they are under constant and very powerful pressure from the families of those who died in this catastrophe.

I have met more than once with the leaders of the Association of Families of KAL-007 Victims since the time IZVESTIYA finished the publication of the first series of reports. Their opinion: "The relationship between the Soviet Union and the United States has improved considerably during the last few years; there is no need to cast a shadow on it... But what happened on the night of 31 August to 1 September 1983 in the sky over Sakhalin—for us, whose relatives and loved ones were on board that Boeing—this is not politics. We can consider this matter closed only when we have the answer to what happened to the bodies; when personal effects and documents discovered at the disaster site are returned; and when we are paid some compensation and are permitted to hold a memorial service where the plane came down."

"Until this happens," I was told at the association, "We will not remain quiet. We will keep pestering them, both yours and ours."

Having sensed during our several meetings the level of persistence of the leaders of the association and their intention to leave, using an American expression, "no stone unturned" in their search for the truth about the incident, I am convinced: They will keep pestering them to the end. Both the Americans and us.

Meanwhile... meanwhile we have again to turn, so to say, to unofficial sources—that is, public ones. And to continue the search for the truth using our own resources.

[signed] Aleksandr Shalnev, IZVESTIYA correspondent, New York.

Meanwhile, what has happened in official echelons in Moscow during the time that has elapsed since publication of our first series of articles? We tried on our own—with the help of the telephone and, whenever possible, through personal meetings—to rouse the military to be open. Or at least to find out their current point of view.

I. Tretyak, former commander of the Far East Military District, over which territory the Korean Boeing was shot down, is now in charge of the PVO [Air Defense] of the country:

[Tretyak] I have read your articles. They are written in a rather frivolous way. The interpretation is, from my point of view, subjective. Therefore, there is more conjecture in them than is necessary.

[Illesh] Forgive me, general, but how much conjecture?

[Tretyak] About 70 percent.

[Illesh] And what may be called the truth?

[Tretyak] Nikolay Vasilyevich Ogarkov answered all questions at the news conference in the fall of 1983. There is nothing to add or retract. (At that news conference the substance of the official Soviet version was delivered, which our investigation has already disproved to a large degree.—Author) I have, however, a question for you: Who needs this investigation; who is behind it; who ordered it?

[Illesh] IZVESTIYA... Conscience, in the final analysis.

[Tretyak] I doubt it...

[Illesh] Who made the decision to destroy the plane?

[Tretyak] We do not need special instructions for this. Any commander may make this decision in his zone of responsibility. The Americans follow the same procedure.

[Illesh] You are accusing us of inaccuracies and conjectures. When no documents are available, a journalist has to look for arguments on his own. Please explain what you meant when you mentioned inaccuracies?

[Tretyak] Well, for instance, the statement that because of this the command transferred Gennadiy Osipovich—the pilot who shot down the Boeing—to another service location. This is not true! His was a scheduled transfer. He would have been transferred from Sakhalin anyway, without the Boeing. Another thing: You write about decorations the military ostensibly received. Well, nobody received anything.[end Tretyak]

Obviously, the army general has not found a whole lot of inaccuracies on the pages of the investigation. And even these are hard to agree with. Unless we assume that every pilot in the USSR (as was the case with Osipovich—Author) is delivered to his new service assignment on the personal plane of the Air Force commander in chief. As to the decorations, the military themselves told us about them.

Here is another attempt to enter into a dialogue with a high-ranking military persona. This time, with USSR Marshal N. Ogarkov, who in 1983 was chief of the USSR Armed Forces General Staff. He is now chairman of the Soviet Committee of Great Patriotic War Veterans.

[Ogarkov] I am familiar with the IZVESTIYA publication. I read it with interest. But all the while I was bothered by one question: Why stir up the past?

[Illesh] Nikolay Vasilyevich, as chief of the General Staff you were informed of all the details of that flight. Is there something new you could say today?

[Ogarkov] To me, it is clear: The South Korean aircraft's flight was a provocation. It was directed by the U.S. special services. There was information periodically transmitted from that aircraft.

[Illesh] Is there any proof of that?

[Ogarkov] I do not have any proof now. And why would I need it? The Americans have all the materials. But they will not give you access to them. Besides, why fan it up again? You are describing how you were searching for the aircraft and what you found... But this is not the main point of it. This does not get us anywhere! Just answer one single question: How could this plane turn 500 kilometers off its flight path?

[Illesh] And what do you think?

[Ogarkov] I do not have the answer; I can only guess. Therefore I will not say anything else. Take these questions to the Americans.[end Ogarkov]

We attempted to break the wall of silence from another side—through civil aviation. Aleksandr Okhonskiy, hero of socialist labor and honored pilot of the USSR, was a member of the commission that investigated the Boeing's destruction. He is retired.

[Okhonskiy] I have nothing to say—I signed a pledge for the organs.

[Illesh] Did you really participate in the investigation?

[Okhonskiy] Yes. At that time I was deputy chairman of the USSR State Committee for Supervision of Aviation. Our commission was working along the ICAO, the International Civil Aviation Organization, line. We forwarded our opinion to the ICAO headquarters in Montreal. By the way, Timofeyev, current deputy minister of civil aviation, was also a member of this commission. I think he has more competence at this point. He is the one who can determine which part of our work may be made public and which may not.

[Illesh] You know, of course, that the ICAO conclusions have been published abroad and are widely known to the public. Thus, there are no particular secrets in the work of your commission...

[Okhonskiy] I will say once again: I signed a pledge and will not discuss anything. Go to Timofeyev.[end Okhonskiy]

We followed his advice and called the deputy minister of civil aviation. Our conversation with Timofeyev lasted less than a minute:

[Timofeyev] I did not shoot down the aircraft (?!—Author). I did not participate in any commissions (?!—Author). Therefore, I have no relevance to your question. I am actually surprised that you are calling me, and not the military...[end Timofeyev]

Thus we came full circle. We have not been able to break the generals' cabal of silence. However, anticipating such a scenario, the newspaper had sent out official inquiries. To three addresses: the Ministry of Defense, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, and the KGB...

First addressee. In reply to the newspaper's request sent to the minister of defense, we received a letter from the General Staff of the USSR Armed Forces:

"The USSR Ministry of Defense, being a participant in the investigation of the incident concerning a South Korean aircraft on 1 September 1983, submitted the information it possessed to the commission charged with the investigation of this incident. It was included in the commission's official documents and made available to the ICAO Council. Subsequently, at the meeting of the ICAO Council and in the course of work of this international organization's subunits, Soviet representatives passed over newly available information materials on the investigation of the incident that were appearing in the press.

"The USSR Ministry of Defense is not related to the private (?!— since when is IZVESTIYA a private business?—Author) investigation of the incident conducted by the newspaper IZVESTIYA, and does not take any responsibility for the content of the published material. I feel compelled to inform you that in January a meeting was held with the newspaper staff member in the General Staff headquarters; at this meeting he was presented with information received from Washington regarding the interest on the part of certain circles in the West—the United States in particular—in certain data, as well as rumors and fabrications, published by IZVESTIYA regarding the 1 September 1983 incident.

"However, in IZVESTIYA No. 27, published on 31 January 1991, your staff member A.V. Illesh described this meeting as a "staged performance" and a "classic political-education hour," while not saying a word about the contents of the materials shown to him. It appears that this was done with the purpose of keeping the readers in the dark as to why and for whose benefit IZVESTIYA is acting by conducting this private (again—private!—Author) investigation. Instead, in order to intrigue the readers, he went into colorful descriptions of the abundance of marble, doors, and coded locks in the building's interior. I would like to use this opportunity to express my regret that IZVESTIYA—an organ of USSR Soviets of People's Deputies—put itself on the same level as publications that continuously conduct anti-Army propaganda, which does not make us more sympathetic to it." Signed: Deputy Chief of the General Staff, Colonel General V. Denisov.

So, we were denied help. And now it is time to explain to the readers what document is being mentioned here. It is true that I was given a certain paper in the General Staff headquarters; we decided not to publish it for one sole reason—we did not want to embarrass the Army leadership. But now we have no choice. (The text is being published in a slightly abridged form).

"Report from Washington. ON THE ANTI-ARMY CAMPAIGN IN THE SOVIET UNION.

"The U.S. military-political leadership intends to make more active the campaign conducted by the American special services with the aim of discrediting the USSR Armed Forces; active participants in this campaign are antisocialist and other destructive elements in the USSR, and their organizations.

"As was learned from private discussions with high-ranking American representatives, **the U.S. National Security Council (NSC) made the decision that, in order to strengthen the anti-Army campaign in the USSR, the 'destruction by the Soviet PVO' of the South Korean passenger airliner KAL-007 on its flight from New York to Seoul in September 1983 could be widely put to use.**

"It was noted that this decision was made by the NSC **two weeks after newspaper IZVESTIYA published, on 20 December 1990, an announcement that its staff had begun**

an 'independent investigation' of this incident (all emphasis in the text not mine—Author), which is explained by the necessity of getting approval for such action at the level of the presidential national security adviser.

"According to NSC recommendations, in the utilization of the incident concerning the destruction of the South Korean airliner the plan is to use the alleged 'premeditation' of the actions of the Soviet military command, which gave the order to open fire on this aircraft. As alleged proof of this they quote the ostensible 'concealment' by the military command of the fact that the Red Banner Pacific Fleet divers quickly discovered the downed airplane at a depth of 30 meters not far from Moneron Island. In addition, in order to discredit the Soviet military command it is also recommended widespread use of the fabrications that the South Korean aircraft was ostensibly—under a shroud of strict secrecy—raised out of the water by the Soviet Navy and destroyed, and the bodies of 269 people on board cremated. The so-called 'black box'—the device that registers the aircraft's flight information—was, however, preserved so that alterations beneficial to the higher Soviet military command could be made to it.

"**The NSC also recommends widespread use of the slogans of democratization and glasnost in the Soviet Union, the implementation of which is ostensibly being obstructed by the Soviet military leadership, which ostensibly also strives to keep secret the truthful information it possesses with regard to the destruction of the South Korean aircraft, and thereby to impede the investigation conducted by the newspaper IZVESTIYA...**"[quotation mark as published] **In this connection, the campaign organized in the United States to discredit the Soviet military leadership is conducted with the purpose of undermining the trust the high military-political leadership of the country has in the USSR Armed Forces**, which are practically the only real force in the country capable of resisting the destructive elements and their organizations striving to take over state power in the USSR."

I really wanted to avoid having to comment on this text; it is even hard to call it a document because of its anonymity and its indeterminate source of information. Besides, it is written very sloppily—this is the only explanation I can offer for its last sentence from which it follows: It is precisely Washington that decided that the Army in our country is "the only real force." I suppose it was also there, in Washington, that they figured out the "destructive forces," into which, apparently, they included me as well...

Coming back to the topic of the Boeing, though, here we also have clear contradictions between this paper and common sense. Look for yourself: It is clear that the results of the journalistic investigation (both those already published and those that still await publication) have not coincided with any of the "conjectures" that are listed in the "American scenario." On the contrary, our materials disprove them! The refusal to cooperate on the part of the military is, unfortunately, very much more in line with the plans and intentions of the American special services—if such plans do indeed exist. The "scenario" presented to me in the General Staff headquarters mentions that the Soviet military leadership "allegedly strives to keep secret the truthful information it possesses." But, in fact, it strives to do exactly that, as we have ourselves found out. Would it not be more sensible to establish the truth through joint efforts, if the concealment of it plays into the hands of the American special services?

We would not go as far as to say that the American special services are completely free of any malicious plans and intrigues in regard to our country. Actually, then, in 1983, in the incident with the destruction of the South Korean aircraft these intrigues were of a somewhat sinister nature. But we have already written about that, and will write more on this topic. We will do so, however, only on the basis of the facts. Meanwhile, the following is important: How easy it turns out to be—to foresee the behavior of our side in someone else's scenarios! After all, this is only half the task—to write the script. The important point is whether somebody would agree to play the part. Alas, they do agree!

The Ministry of Defense is not alone, however, in its persistent silence. Similar letters were sent by the newspaper to two other addresses—the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the KGB. From there (in line with the tradition)—no papers. Only a telephone call on the secure line: We do not have in our possession any information, documents, or anything at all related to the Korean aircraft. This was the reply from the director of the KGB Center for Public Liaison, General Karbainov.

The newspaper never received a reply from the foreign policy department either. Although it was more often that they called from Smolenskaya Square to us on Pushkinskaya Square and promised to present their point of view. Apparently, they never decided what it was. A pity...

The surprising part is that, if we judge by official instances, the USSR and the United States in this story look like silent partners. Twin brothers... Now this is something nobody could imagine before—for instance, in September 1983.

To tell the truth, we were ready for such a turn of events in relations with the high military brass. It was something else that left a much deeper wound. The fact of how deeply this militarized conscience is rooted in the psychology of the people in our society; how persistent is this image of the enemy (this refers first of all to the United States); and how easy it is to slap the label of "CIA agent" on someone. There are a lot of them—letters we had to put in a folder labeled "aggressive."

Still, there were not as many of these as there were letters of another kind — kind, interested, offering help. Now is a good time to mention the most important item—about the military. Not about marshals and commanders in chief, but about colonels, majors, lieutenants, sergeant majors, and privates. It was among them that our staff found volunteer helpers in the investigation, experts, and witnesses. It was their letters, and getting acquainted with them, that allows me to say that there are many people among the Army intelligentsia who cannot be accused of the desire to blacken the Army—for they serve in it—but who have retained the ability and the need to critically analyze the past and the present. Including that of our Armed Forces.

[signed] Andrey Illesh.

To be continued.

Third Installment of Part Two

91UF0752A Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 17 May 91 Union Edition p 6

["IZVESTIYA Investigation. Part Two." by Sergey Agafonov: "Secret of the Korean Boeing-747": third article of the current series]

[Text] Tokyo—**After the series of publications on the reporters' investigation of the facts and circumstances surrounding the destruction of the South Korean Boeing-747 airliner, KAL Flight 007, on the night of 31 August to 1 September 1983, IZVESTIYA's Tokyo bureau received a gamut of responses from dozens of people; it also received inquiries from the mass media (and not only Japanese)... Specialists and experts got interested in the ongoing course of the investigation. "Things of the days long past" came again into the focus of extensive attention on the part of both the Soviet and world public—not only because of unique evidence presented on the pages of our newspaper, but, first and foremost, because one of the main issues related to the tragedy of the South Korean Boeing still does not have an answer: What happened to the remains of the airliner's 269 passengers?**

III.

The versions featuring an "empty aircraft" and a "secret burial of the bodies," as well as suppositions that the remains had been destroyed by the sea animals or that they had been dispersed by the force of the impact and by powerful currents, are all good only as a basis for hypotheses: The facts, alas, are scant.

There are documents lifted from the bottom of the sea near Moneron Island; there is a wide assortment of "everyday items"—although, as the divers noticed, a rather strange one: What is missing are the people who used all of these items. To be more precise—frightening as it may be to write about it—there is no proof that all 269 passengers are buried in the deep exactly at the same coordinates, exactly in the same specific location where the search teams found the aircraft downed by missiles.

This is a circumstance that is hard to explain; nevertheless, it demands explanation. Or at the very least an attempt to tie up the loose ends.

I know a person who has been trying for nearly eight years, since the tragic 1 September 1983, to follow his own road in the investigation of the circumstances of the South Korean Boeing destruction. His name has already been mentioned once in the IZVESTIYA publications—it is Michel Bran [as transliterated]. The conclusions of the Frenchman—a former flier and now an expert—are bringing out a surprisingly unanimous chorus of accusations of being "ridiculous" on the part of official representatives; IZVESTIYA justly appraised his version as "fantastic." But the problem is that at this point it seems that only Michel Bran's "fantasy" is able to remove many inconsistencies. The Frenchman has collected and analyzed all official statements published in relation to the incident, without challenging whatever was said and printed. It was in this process of comparison that it became obvious that many facts in the story of the KAL-007 flight differ from one another. Also, whatever has become known little by little over the years seems to fit Bran's version—including, I must say at the outset, the IZVESTIYA investigation.

Our first meeting took place two and a half years ago; the latest, this week. Yes, one might once again accuse the Frenchman of having a bent toward fantasy; I am convinced, however, that he is worth listening to.

So, what is the substance of Bran's version? In a few words, it boils down to one simple assumption: The Boeing passenger plane... was not shot down over Sakhalin—the catastrophe took place someplace else. I suspect that some of the readers familiar with the materials of the IZVESTIYA investigation will ask a rhetorical question after reading this phrase: Does the French expert's medical history indicate a history of mental illness? Such a thought seems to be quite legitimate if we take into account that the downed intruder into Soviet airspace was found at the bottom of the sea and was thoroughly "disemboweled" in the course of underwater work that went on for many days. From this point of view Bran's version does look like a pure "nonsense"; still...

Mr. Bran took some time spreading papers, copies of all sorts of documents, and photos on the table; then he smiled mysteriously and expressed, quite sincerely, his admiration for the immense work that had been conducted by IZVESTIYA in collecting the materials related to the Boeing tragedy. "Your investigation is invaluable to me," said the Frenchman, "since it presents the most powerful proof of the correctness of the scenario that I have been working to prove for so many years. In this case, the most important thing is specific details which may be overlooked by a dilettante, but which professionals would immediately jump on. In the past, I had participated in the investigation of a number of large civil aviation catastrophes, so I remember that when I first heard of the disappearance of the South Korean Boeing, I immediately told myself: It will be found within two weeks. A month at the outside—the largest 'passenger' in the world cannot be lost in shallow waters with a bottom flat as a plate (This is not the case, however, and the reader will see later where the problem lies.—Andrey Illesh); even far smaller aircraft have been found in ocean crevices 1.5 to 2 km deep. Alas, I was wrong in my forecast—some sort of classified game started, with the participation of a multitude of 'influential parties' and with the advancement of explanations that could not hold any water. Lies were coming not only from the Soviet Union, but also from the United States, Japan, and South Korea. Why? I do not know; I am not a politician. I am an expert who is only interested in facts.

"For instance, your newspaper published the testimony of the pilot who ostensibly shot down the Boeing—Mr. Osipovich. I rely completely on this testimony. There was a target and the pilot shot it down—everything is correct. But what kind of a target—that is the question! If you recall, Osipovich said that after takeoff he was flying toward the sea for eight minutes, having been informed that the target was ahead of him and on an opposite course. The pilot did not find this target, reversed his course, and then saw the target. So, does it turn out that one target was left behind him, while another turned out to be in front of him? Does it mean there were two targets?

"Let us go further. Osipovich tells us that the intruder's shape resembled that of the Soviet TU-16 bomber. Osipovich is a professional and could not make a mistake; the shape of the TU-16 is that of a long 'pencil,' while the Boeing-747 is a thick 'banana.' So, whom was Osipovich pursuing? Let us go still further. The Soviet pilot talks about a MiG-23, which was also airborne at that time, sending a radio message that he was observing air combat. What combat? By the way, by writing about the MiG, IZVESTIYA refuted itself on the issue of the so-called 'return boundary'—limitations on the fuel load introduced after Belenko's escape to Japan. If there is a 'return boundary,' then why did the MiG have additional external fuel tanks? Or were they empty, just for decorative purposes? And why did the MiG jettison them in the air? To increase speed—this is an answer for dilettantes; professionals know that a fighter plane jettisons external fuel tanks when it prepares to attack a supersonic target.

"So, did Osipovich shoot down the aircraft, or did he not? Of course he did, and Marshal Kirsanov is right when he says that the target was destroyed and then later found in the sea. But nobody says that it was a passenger Boeing, because, as it appears to me, Osipovich 'dropped' a completely different plane—not the one carrying 269 passengers that boarded in Anchorage.

"If you are interested, let us continue our comparisons. The passenger Boeing, as is known, was 'tracked' not only by Soviet, but also by Japanese radars. Well, according to Japanese data, after Osipovich's victorious report 'The target is destroyed!' sounded on the air waves, the KAL-007... gathered speed and altitude—which, you will agree, does not at all fit with the picture of an airliner torn apart by the missile 'doublet,' which, in accordance with the laws of physics, should have been falling into the sea at precisely that time. There is one more discrepancy here—according to Osipovich himself, the first missile was fired when the distance to the intruder was 5 km; according to Japanese recordings of the Soviet pilots' conversation and according to the ICAO [International Civil Aviation Organization] report, the report on the target kill came one second after the missile launch. However, there is no way, under any circumstances, that a missile from a Sukhoi can travel 5 km in one second. Something is clearly wrong here, but let us not linger on it.

"The official version cannot explain the Boeing's behavior on Japanese radars; if we assume, however, that Osipovich had shot down not the 'passenger,' but some other aircraft, everything falls into place—the airliner continued its flight; in such a case, it also explains another apparent 'mystery' related to the KAL-007 flight—having its pilots on the radio 50 minutes after the Boeing was 'buried' by the Soviet fighter."

(This, too, is not a fantasy, but an official recording of the KAL-007 pilots' conversations, which figures as a document in both Japan and the United States. At this point I must note the following. Just recently, during my trip to New York, Aleksandr Shalnev and I met with John Keppel [as transliterated]—a former diplomat, whose activities we already mentioned in the first part of the investigation. This elderly and persistent man does not waste time; he expends considerable means in his capacity as the Foundation for Constitutional Government's chief investigator on the KAL-007 affair. In particular, he also got involved in the verification of a documented (?) fact of Flight 007's captain's (?) communication with Narita airport, that took place (?) substantially later than Lieutenant Colonel Osipovich's successful attack. Asahi Television correspondents in Moscow showed me the transcript of the conversations between Flights 015 and 050—the aircraft that were also flying the Alaska-Seoul route but at a later time—and the Tokyo airport; it is these conversations where an unidentified voice twice cut in. According to my Japanese colleagues, the deciphering of this recording—made independently in the United States and in Japan—says that the voice belongs to the KAL-007 captain!

(It is not possible to question the supermodern technology which was used to decipher this recording. But in the tragic story of the Korean passenger airliner's destruction many unsolvable mysteries of ostensibly 100-percent-proof documents had been explained by the fact that these documents had been first "worked over" by specialists. One should not, of course, dismiss any version, for a negative proof in our case is also a very important proof! Summing up briefly what has been said so far, I am inclined to insist on the IZVESTIYA version: The Boeing-747 was shot down and is resting on the bottom of the sea near Moneron Island. The newspaper has not only precise coordinates of the location where it fell, but also material evidence raised from the bottom of the sea. Including a piece from the aircraft outer skin with a number painted on the metal. But let Bran continue his tale.—Andrey Illesh)

"And one more moment related to what happened in the sky over Sakhalin," says Michel Bran. "If we rely on the assumption that the Soviet fighters (several of them were airborne) were pursuing only one target—the Boeing-747—the behavior of Osipovich's colleagues in the air defies explanation. According to the data contained in official reports, Soviet combat aircraft were moving in a pattern of sharp changes in altitude and course, almost on a sine. Can you imagine a passenger Boeing going through this kind of pirouettes trying to shake off a 'tail?' I cannot. But I would have no doubts if we assumed that on that memorable day (or night, to be precise) there were several targets—supersonic at that—your pilots were chasing.

"Finally, the last circumstance, before we come down from the sky to the sea. In his interview with IZVESTIYA, Osipovich states that he saw the intruder 'through scattered clouds.'

"I believe Osipovich, but the problem is that at the altitudes where the Boeing-747 was flying at that time, there were no clouds—scattered or otherwise! This is confirmed by the data from Japanese air traffic control services, whom I also believe. So, what does it mean—that someone is still lying? Not at all! The information is correct in both cases. Except that, still, it was a passenger airliner Osipovich was pursuing and then shot down.

"To prove this, however, we have to go over to the next phase of this mysterious story..." (To Be Continued)

Shevardnadze's 'Private Diplomacy' Analyzed

PM2005121391 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 18 May 91 First Edition p 1

[Vyacheslav Lukashevich article under the "Seven Days" rubric: "What Next—'Private Diplomacy'?"]

[Text] Oh, how innocently naive we are! The things that we believe in, the sources from which we seek a panacea for all our misfortunes! Even until quite recently, prompted by sensible commentators, we sincerely pinned our hopes on "people's diplomacy," seriously assuming that a group of kids of preschool age arriving from Detroit, for example, would be capable of improving mutual relations between the two superpowers. It looks as if we have to come to our senses and sober up. But now, following in the footsteps of Soviet private detectives, we see the emergence of Soviet private diplomats roaming the world allegedly for the sake of the motherland's salvation.

"Tell me, Comrade Lukashevich," reader Yu.A. Plyushch from Moscow writes, "how many foreign ministers do we have now? As I recall, previously we had just Shevardnadze, who later abandoned the 'political ship.' He was replaced by Bessmertnykh who, in my view, is sophisticated and educated. But I heard recently that the U.S. President received Shevardnadze and the latter asked Bush for $1.5 billion to prevent the Russian people from dying of starvation. On what basis? What is happening, is Shevardnadze hoping to mess up our state a little more? In exchange for $1.5 billion? As if he has not done enough already? And why is this not done by our esteemed president, who took an oath to look after the country's prosperity?"

I realize that this is a sharp letter. I quote it nonetheless because this viewpoint does have its supporters just like, by the way, there are supporters of those who hasten to proclaim—I think that one of the latest was V. Tsvetov on the day of Russian Television's inauguration—that the former foreign minister is almost a genius of our time. And it took off from there. Some people persistently promote the idea of Eduard Amvrosiyevich as UN secretary general, while some foreign reporters go off on another tangent: Is the "Soviet Henry Kissinger," as NEWSWEEK described him, likely to run for USSR president when the time comes for the president to be elected in a nationwide ballot once the Union Treaty is signed?

It must be noted, incidentally, that the arrival of the USSR Foreign Policy Association's president on the other side of the ocean became an "impressive event." A photograph showing him wearing the gown of honorary doctor of sciences of Boston University appeared in a series of influential U.S. publications, authoritative television programs organized interviews with him, while the newspaper NEWSDAY remarked: "Following a conversation with former U.S. President Carter in Atlanta, Shevardnadze is due to address a graduation ceremony at Emory University where his granddaughter Tamuna Mosashvili is in her freshman year."

I cannot speak from personal experience, but people who know claim that the feelings of grandparents are stronger than those of parents. But I would not like readers to get confused by this opinion. Nor by the fact, by the way, that the official purpose of the trip by the former minister and head of an institute, which is rather esoteric as far as ordinary readers are concerned, was to obtain funds for the organization he has set up. I have had an opportunity to study some of Eduard Amvrosiyevich's public statements. According to reports by that selfsame NEWSWEEK, Shevardnadze intends to spend 24 days delivering public speeches and should receive from the San Francisco firm "Diomedes, Inc." the sum of $100,000 plus reimbursement of all expenses incurred during his stay in the United States. And so, having read the former minister's interview and his public statements, I arrived at the conclusion that the main purpose may have been different: to justify his resignation on the other side of the ocean. After all, I do think that people there may be questioning: Shevardnadze resigned his position as head of the foreign policy department on perceiving the threat of approaching dictatorship, but five months have already passed since last December and the threat of dictatorship has simply failed to appear on the political horizon. Furthermore, there has also been a turn toward democratic transformations, which was also enshrined in the "9+1" statement.

It is obvious that the bogey of dictatorship proved to be rather full of holes. Nonetheless, "Mr. Glasnost" (another description of the visitor to the United States used by the Washington press) was relentless in depicting the image of this terrible monster which has raised its sharp-clawed paws over the country.

"Do you still believe," a FORTUNE magazine staffer asked E.A. Shevardnadze, "that dictatorship is possible?"

"Yes," was the ensuing answer. "The situation now is even more complex. Social tension is growing... Gorbachev himself is talking about possible chaos. And if chaos is possible, then the threat of dictatorship certainly exists. It is said that chaos leads to the most terrifying dictatorships..."

Another question: "How realistic is the threat of a right-wing military coup?"

And the answer: "This is one possible option. But I cannot be certain—the dictator could be either a military man, or a civilian, or even someone completely unknown whom we never took into account..."

Another newspaper—THE WASHINGTON POST—carried an article entitled "Wounded But Not Finished" in its 9 May issue. Jim Hoagland writes in it about Eduard Shevardnadze's "unspoken judgment" of the likely fate of his "former partner in revolution." "Gorbachev," the author explains, "will tack and trim between orthodoxy and reform and will stay afloat. But he will not again practice the bold leadership that liberated Eastern Europe and changed the world."

The journalist professionally detects several "fresh scars" and, naturally, does not forget the former minister's "opponents": "They failed, and now blame Shevardnadze personally for 'destroying the socialist commonwealth.'"

"I am not talking about criticism," Shevardnadze said about charges of treason (I am still quoting from the article—V.L.) leveled against him by Soviet generals and party hardliners. "I am talking about attacks and slander that went unanswered by Gorbachev."

The journalist draws his own conclusion: "Shevardnadze's absence from the Kremlin today is decisive in the stalemating of President Bush's hopes for replacing the cold war by a new world order."

An eloquent conclusion, nonetheless. Especially when backed by what Pentagon chief R. Cheney said after the conclusion of the Persian Gulf war: "The United States emerges from all these events as the only genuine superpower in the world." The London SUNDAY TIMES observer is even more outspoken: "...The United States is now an unequaled world power. Its superiority over the Soviet Union in political and military might is striking and has evidently impressed even the Red Army generals. It is the only country in the world capable of waging large-scale high-tech warfare... We no longer have two superpowers. There is one hyperpower, and all the rest lag far behind it."

I beg the readers' pardon for quoting so extensively, but it seems to me that the past lauding of our foreign policy activity under the former minister's leadership on the one hand, coupled with the cynical admission of their superiority by some figures in the West on the other, boil down to a logical combination. Like the combination of "blows" aimed at the Armed Forces, ranging from unequal arms cuts and so on to campaigns of slander and accusations leveled against the Army by champions of "democracy." I do not know in what way a "cold peace" is better than a "cold war," but I would like to say a few words about the new world order proposed by "the best friends of perestroyka in the Soviet Union." Let me cite the foreign press again. Under the pretext of maintaining stability in Europe, the United States is claiming the right to interfere in the USSR's internal affairs. Back in March, TIME magazine published an article entitled "Steppe Shield?", which discussed this very option. "This possibility," the author notes, "is certainly not overlooked in Pentagon and CIA corridors: It is possible to envision circumstances in which this dilemma will at least have to be tackled."

It is also worth noting the recent recommendations by NATO's Military Committee about creating within the alliance's framework a highly mobile rapid reaction force in Europe, numbering some 70,00-100,000 servicemen. According to explanations by Willem van Eekelen of the Netherlands, secretary general of the Western European Union, this force could be used in a crisis situation along the Soviet Union's borders with Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, or Romania.

Viewed from this angle, I feel that Washington's position on economic aid for the USSR becomes somewhat clearer. I think that Jaroslav Hasek's slightly paraphrased joke would be most suitable for this situation: America favors "a moderate process in the Soviet Union within the framework of U.S. interests." Of course, a "world order" presupposes order throughout the world, including our little corner of it, dear readers. It is not surprising, therefore, that Eduard Amvrosiyevich has also joined the talk about this $1.5 billion, acting as foreign affairs mediator between Gorbachev and Bush and, in his own words, as a citizen and individual "knowing that this question is being discussed in principle." But he also knows that it is not all that easy to actually get hold of the money; a payment in political currency has to be made in exchange. I am, on the other hand, confident that the Foreign Policy Association's chairman will receive his own $100,000 within, of course, the framework of interests. Just like Academician G. Arbatov; G. Yavlisnkiy, one of the authors of the "500 Days" program who was also in the United States at the same time; and many other "private diplomats" who received their own share earlier.

Incidentally, Eduard Amvrosiyevich enjoyed yet another happy opportunity to kiss his beloved granddaughter, as well as to declare from U.S. rostrums that he and G. Popov would create a new nationwide democratic party which would become "a support for Gorbachev."

We would like to believe this.

We have already come to believe that the numerous "private diplomats" will not save the country from starvation.

Possible G-7 Role in Crisis Recovery Foreseen

PM2005112991 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 18 May 91 p 1

[S. Bobrovskiy report: "'9 plus 1'—Plus 7?. The G-7 Countries and Our Standstill Economy"]

[Text]

The CIA Reports

The Soviet Union's economic position this current year will be "considerably worse" than last, says a joint report by the CIA and the Defense Intelligence Agency submitted to Congress' Joint Economic Committee Thursday. As the document notes, if the current "restraint" in relations between the center and the union republics persists, by the end of the year USSR GNP will have fallen by 10 to 15 percent and the average annual level of inflation will have reached more than 100 percent.

A few years back we would have regarded such information as the gloating and malevolence of "Western special services." Today, with our hand on our heart, we have to acknowledge that the CIA analysts' forecast precisely matches our own anxious forebodings.

Our present prime minister's tough domestic economic policy aimed at forcing citizens to tighten their belts has, by all accounts, failed. Most people's standard of living is rapidly approaching that fateful minimum subsistence level. The population's food stocks and reserves of money are falling.

Incidentally, regarding "belt-tightening": Is economizing always justified? There is sense in economizing in order to put all one's resources into increasing goods and future prosperity. It seems that thus far we have been asked to tighten our belts merely to make our meager rations stretch a little further.

Here are the results of the country's work in the first quarter (USSR State Committee for Statistics data). The volume of industrial output, compared with last year's figures, is 95 percent; national income fell by 10 percent. Alcoholic drinks production is the SOLE sector on the rise. The union budget deficit is already running at 26.9 billion rubles [R] in the first quarter (against a forecast R26.7 billon for the whole year!).

A WASHINGTON POST article, citing the IMF, claims that the USSR will need $20 to 30 billion in the form of loans and credits this year to purchase food and equipment and repay debt credits to the West. Okay, so will we manage to get by from one harvest to the next by means of "humanitarian handouts"? Hardly. The IMF and the World Bank no longer advise that loans be granted to the USSR—it is like pouring money down the drain—and they urge foreign states to wait until the USSR pushes forward more resolutely along the path of economic reforms.

So reform is the price demanded of us for aid. And that is normal: It is not shameful to go into debt in order to get out of a crisis (particularly when there is no option). It is shameful to consume the handouts while indulging in superfluous talk about reforms.

By all accounts, our president's stock abroad has risen just recently. For this he needed to sign the "9 plus 1" agreement and to win a convincing victory at the Central Committee plenum.

Judging by the press, Gorbachev is holding consultations with "new wave" economists. Grigoriy Yavlinskiy is working, along with his colleagues, on his own concept of reform. The team involved in drafting the "500 Days" Program is heading for the United States for the joint drafting of a version of the "Marshall plan" for the Soviet Union, which could be submitted to the next G-7 conference.

TASS Reports

According to FINANCIAL TIMES figures, USSR President Gorbachev has asked the G-7 states to extend "financial and technical aid in exchange for in-depth transformations in the Soviet economy." As the newspaper notes, the proposed plan envisions the "active participation of G-7 experts in creating the economic program and a parallel program designed to back up the reforms."

It cannot be ruled out that the "Marshall plan" idea will arouse the fierce opposition of homespun patriots. But the truth has to be faced: We are not in a position to boast, citing our "great power" title. Perestroyka is a process measured on a geopolitical scale, it is not just our "private" affair. We have the right to count on cooperation, but we must be ready to give guarantees that we will at least refrain from stupidity.

Conference To Discuss Human Rights Worldwide

OW2105055291 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1900 GMT 20 May 91

[From "Diplomatic Panoroma", DP]

[Text] Due to begin tomorrow, May 21, the so-called "Sakharov readings" scheduled to coincide with the 70th anniversary of the famous human rights champion's birth are the first of the concurrent events to be held within the format of the Moscow Human Dimension Conference. The conference is to take place from September 10 to October 4, and the May 17 press-confernece announced that the event would be divided into two stages. Foreign ministers of the 35 Helsinki nations will get together at the first stage, to be followed by the discussion of the human rights agenda by their representatives.

The Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev appointed Soviet Deputy Foreign Secretary Vladimir Petrovskiy as executive secretary of the Mosow Conference who is to come into office on August 11. Until that date coordination will be the responsibility of the Preparatory Committee's secretary Victor Shikalov (telephone 244-43 88).

The sittings will be held at the House of Congresses and will be covered by around 1000 journalists (up from 573 in Copenhagen). The accreditation procedure will be made known soon. According to the press-conference organizers, security will be tight.

The sittings will be held concurrently at the Central Tourist House and the CPSU Central Committee's Social Sociences Academy, and the same facilities will provide accommodation for the participants (the total number of Soviet and foreign participants is expected to be around 15,000, up from 10,000 in Copenhagen).

Yuriy Reshetov, a senior staffer of the Soviet Foreign Ministry DP has talked with, said that the agenda of the Moscow Conference will concentate on the examination by all the Helsinki nations of the human rights situation. Asked about the Soviet line at the forthcoming meeting, he said that "we will take efforts to explain how we have been seeking to raise human-rights standards in this country". "It is clearly too early to maintain that the Soviet human-rights record is now impeccably clean, and the subject retains its importance for us", he said, but, according to Reshetov, "it is not a one-way street". We expect the Moscow conference to address the human rights situation around the globe, not in the USSR alone, he said. None of the delegations can posture as "crusaders" and believe its country unassailable on this touchy issue as each country has "problems of its own".

Reshetov named some of the problems. Britain, for example, had slipped on the so-called "Birmingham Six" case though the convicted six have at long last been exonerated. The USA was outraged by the Rodney King beating by policemen, a case that has been mentioned at the latest sitting of the UN Human Rights Commission in Geneva. Also, the commission has put under the spotlight the situation in Quebec, Canada, a province that decided last year to use troops against Indians. Generally speaking, the position of the national minorities is likely to become one of the highlights at the Moscow conference, says the Soviet diplomat. In fact, not only the USSR but also even Sweden, a country with a model human-rights record, has faults. The Saami, an ethnic group that features prominently in Sweden's social and economic life, is not represented in parliament.

But we would be extremely unreasonable to start levelling accusations against anyone, said the Soviet diplomat. According to him, "There's still a lot to be done to humanize the Soviet prison regime. A new law on psychiatric help is pending that, hopefully, will set things straight in legal terms." Nor is it fully clear (at the moment of this writing) whether the emigration bill will finally pass the USSR Supreme Soviet. There still are several cases of the "old refuseniks", but they are being addressed, said Soviet Foreign Ministry senior staffer Reshetov. When asked questions by the conference participants, we will give frank answers to provide a full picture of the Soviet human rights situation, he said in conclusion. We do not intend to act on the traditional Soviet "look-at-yourself" principle, emphasized Reshetov.

United States & Canada

Moscow Denies Paper's Charge of Missile in Cuba

CM2105093391 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 21 May 91 Second Edition p 5

[Defense Ministry Press Center press release: "Another Falsehood"—PRAVDA headline]

[Text] Recently THE WASHINGTON POST published an article by observers R. Evans and R. Novak, citing anonymous representatives of the intelligence community, which alleges that on 25 April U.S. intelligence-gathering satellites discovered a Soviet SS-20 missile in Cuba.

It should be recalled in connection with this that the last RSD-10 (the SS-20, according to the Western classification) missile the USSR had was destroyed at the Kapustin Yar testing ground on 12 May 1991 in strict accordance with the Soviet-American treaty on liquidation of intermediate and short-range missiles and in the presence of inspectors from the United States and representatives of the Soviet and foreign media. Missiles of this type were never supplied by the USSR abroad and were not deployed outside the territory of our country.

THE WASHINGTON POST's allegation about a Soviet SS-20 being discovered in Cuba has no real grounds at all and is a concoction from beginning to end. It is perfectly obvious that the appearance in the paper of yet another crude falsehood is directed at undermining confidence in the USSR's consistent and open policy in the area of disarmament and runs counter to the fundamental interests of the Soviet and American peoples, and the cause of strengthening security and peace throughout the world.

Fitzwater Refutes Article

LD2105075191 Moscow TASS in English 0735 GMT 21 May 91

[By TASS correspondent Aleksey Berezhkov]

[Text] Washington may 21 TASS—The White House and the U.S. State department on Monday refuted reports that Cuba has Soviet SS- 20 missiles on its territory. The reports appeared in an article published by WASHINGTON POST. Its authors are well-known news analysts Robert Novak and Rowland Evans. Referring to intelligence sources, they alleged that SS-20s were spotted in Cuba in April by American spy satellites.

White House Press Spokesman Marlin Fitzwater said at a regular news briefing that the White House had no information in corroboration of this fact.

State department spokesman Margaret Tutwiler, in turn, responding to journalists' questions, said the state department was unaware of any SS-20 missiles in Cuba. She recalled that a year ago Cubans displayed an inoperable Soviet SS-4 missile at a Havana museum. The treaty to eliminate intermediate- and short-range missiles (INF) allows the use of such missiles as static exhibits on condition of preliminary notification about this move. The Soviet Union complied with this condition and informed the United States.

Bush's 'New World Order' Seen as 'Old' Idea

PM2005113591 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 17 May 91 First Edition p 3

[Article by observer Colonel M. Ponomarev under the "World Today: Problems and Opinions" rubric: "Old Ideas in New Packaging"]

[Text] It is hard to say whether this was so or not, but, if NEWSWEEK magazine is to be believed, G. Bush first advanced the idea of the need to create a "new world order" in a conversation with B. Scowcroft, his national security adviser, during a fishing trip off the coast of Kennebunkport last August. Since then this formula has firmly become part of the U.S. political lexicon. And so it would undoubtedly be interesting to investigate what it means and what is concealed behind it.

I will apologize to readers in advance for my abundant use of quotes. But I would like to reveal the design behind the order which the United States is seeking to establish in the world in the words of its originator.

So, a "new world order." Here is a definition by Bush himself, from his annual State of the Union message: "We bear a unique responsibility for carrying out the difficult work of defending freedom. Of all countries in the world, the United States alone has the moral weight and the ability to defend it." And here are his words from his program speech to Congress after the completion of Operation Desert Storm: "Hitherto the world which we have known has been a divided world, a world of barbed wire and concrete obstacles, of conflict and cold war. Now we can see the outlines of a new world taking shape. A world in which a very real prospect of creating a new world order exists... We have much to do in our own country and abroad. And we will do it. We are Americans."

I could also cite other statements in this regard. But the essence is already clear: The United States is the only superpower, and it is predestined by fate itself to rule the world. And it at once becomes obvious that the new concept is not actually that new. It is a question of the same old Pax Americana—peace American-style—which the United States has been seeking so insistently throughout the postwar years.

It would, however, be wrong to maintain that it is a matter only of renovated verbal packaging. No, it is all far more serious. Here it is necessary to point to a number of extremely important circumstances.

First, the incontestable fact that the world has changed decisively in recent years. Perestroyka in the Soviet Union, the assertion of the new political thinking, and the collapse of "barrack socialism" in East European countries have led to fundamental changes in the international arena. The harsh Soviet-U.S. confrontation, the arms race, and the Cold War have vanished into the past. Washington needed to define its role under the new conditions, and some people there came to believe that this was an undoubted and unconditional victory for the West, and for the United States above all, and attested to its strength and moral rightness in the struggle against "godless communism."

Second, the changing perceptions of the Soviet Union, which Americans used to see as an equal or even a greater "superpower" in terms of strength but which now, as the political, economic, and other crises which we are experiencing grow deeper, appears weakened, forced increasingly to retreat, and no longer posing a deadly military threat.

Third, the excessive euphoria over the victory in the war against Iraq, won at a comparatively light cost, when the United States on the one hand managed to enlist broad international support and, on the other, unequivocally demonstrated its military might.

It was precisely these and certain other circumstances that led to the reincarnation of the old concept of "peace American-style" as the "new world order." At the same time, as in the past, U.S. state interests are brought to the fore in this concept and take priority in foreign policy. This means a desire for national security. The establishment of a world economic order which will best meet the interests of U.S. monopolies. Free access (for the United States, of course) to the most important raw material resources—oil, above all. And all these interests must be ensured by force—military force, above all.

Rapture over its own might and the revival of U.S. globalist trends have also been projected onto Soviet-U.S. relations. The thesis of the need to "integrate the Soviet Union into the international system as a constructive partner," which was aired in the U.S. President's message to Congress last year on national security strategy, has been pushed aside.

Those who reckon that under the present conditions it is possible to put the Soviet Union "in its place" or even to disregard it entirely in world politics have clearly predominated in Washington since the end of last year. Their views have probably been expressed most clearly of all in the journal POLICY REVIEW, in whose opinion the Soviet Union's disappearance from the political map accords with long-term U.S. aims. "The survival of a centralized Soviet Union which might be capable of posing a military threat to Europe and America is not in America's interests," this journal wrote. It is preferable by far to have, instead of a strong center, "a weakened confederation of more or less sovereign states which will prove too weak or not ready to threaten Europe or the United States."

Such a viewpoint was not only expressed. Its adherents began exerting increasingly strong pressure on Washington's policy. Let us recall, for example, the very significant pause which came about recently in Soviet-U.S. relations. The long-planned summit meeting was unexpectedly postponed. Work on the treaty on strategic offensive arms came to a standstill.

The voices of those leading figures in the Washington administration who continue to advocate deferment of a new Soviet-U.S. top-level meeting can still be heard today. They include Defense Secretary Cheney, National Security Adviser Scowcroft, and White House Chief of Staff Sununu. But there is also a different viewpoint. Secretary of State Baker, for example, is in favor of not delaying such a meeting. Not that such pluralism of opinions comes as a surprise to anyone in America. In the final analysis, all those who sometimes contradict each other so harshly are acting in the U.S. interest. And the President, while heeding both sets of people, is free to make his own choice.

Following a period of temporizing and doubts, he has to all appearances made his choice. The pragmatism inherent in U.S. leaders has triumphed. This is borne out by the conversation with the USSR President held a few days ago at the initiative of the White House chief. Convinced that Gorbachev's position is quite strong—as shown both by the joint statement of the "nine plus one" and by the results of the recent CPSU Central Committee plenum—Bush decided, so London's THE GUARDIAN writes, to "support the beleaguered Soviet leader." Hence the resumption of the dialogue and the mutual statement that Soviet-U.S. relations remain good.

One of the outward reasons for a certain cooling of these relations in the recent past—actually accounted for by uncertainty over where internal development in the Soviet Union is leading—was American doubts about the USSR's readiness to adhere to the Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe, signed in Paris. It was to resolve these doubts that an accord was reached on the U.S. visit by Army General M.A. Moiseyev, chief of the USSR Armed Forces General Staff, to resolve the existing problems finally and comprehensively. And, if they are resolved, an opportunity will be opened up to complete work on the strategic offensive arms treaty. There are no political problems here—just purely technical ones. But the political determination to tackle them is needed.

All this makes it possible to think with a certain degree of optimism about the prospects for further developing Soviet-U.S. relations, which, whatever might be said there, remain the cornerstone of world politics. And the Washington creators of the "new world order" concept cannot disregard this. But neither can we disregard the fact that they have not abandoned the idea of achieving military superiority over us. Priority is still given to this idea in building the armed forces. It has been made the basis of the new plan drawn up by the Pentagon for waging war against the Soviet Union, which provides for nuclear missile strikes to be made against thousands of targets on the territory of the USSR and also of East European countries.

There is no doubt that all this fits within the concept of the "new world order." Here is what Defense Secretary R. Cheney says about this: "Peace and stability throughout the world will continue to depend on U.S. strength and determination, on our readiness to ensure an active presence throughout the world, wherever our interests and our allies' interests might be under threat." These words unequivocally express the U.S. desire to exercise world leadership and have its superpower status underpinned, above all, by military force.

Politics of U.S., World Aid to USSR Viewed

PM2005141191 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 18 May 91 Union Edition p 5

[Unattributed report: "Will America Help With Credit?"]

[Text] Official U.S. State Department Spokesman Boucher announced at a briefing that a delegation of high-ranking U.S. specialists is flying to Moscow today and will "collect information about the food situation and problems of food distribution in the Soviet Union and submit recommendations to the U.S. President as to how we can help in this connection." According to Boucher, "information about the political and economic reforms which the delegation collects will also be used to further study President Gorbachev's request for guarantees of additional credits."

THE WASHINGTON POST has published a lengthy article today which, citing figures from the IMF and the CIA, points out that this year the Soviet Union will need 20-30 billion dollars in the form of loans and credits to buy food and equipment and extinguish its debts to the West.

"Colt, the CIA's chief expert on Soviet affairs," the newspaper points out, "has described the state of the Soviet economy as 'rapidly deteriorating.' According to him the Soviet economy is disintegrating and perhaps moving toward a catastrophe on a historic scale. Addressing the Congressional Joint Economic Committee, he said that the volume of industrial production in the USSR could decline 10-15 percent this year and inflation could reach 100 percent. Even if reforms are carried out anew, Colt said, the Soviets face hard times. If there are no substantial reforms the country's economic position will be gloomy."

"Western governments, the IMF, and the World Bank," the newspaper continues, "differ on the question of what to do about the USSR's requests for loans. The IMF and the World Bank say that giving money to the USSR is like pouring water into the sand and urge the industrial states to wait until the USSR is advancing resolutely along the path of economic reforms. Other officials say that the industrial countries of the West will come to the USSR's assistance for political reasons, including the need to curb emigration from the USSR."

China

Jiang Zemin Visits Leningrad

LD1805162191 Moscow TASS in English 1601 GMT 18 May 91

[By TASS correspondents Viktor Bezbrezhniy and Nikolay Kondratenko]

[Text] Leningrad May 18 TASS—Chinese Communist Party leader Jiang Zemin, who arrived in Leningrad today, alighted from the jetliner to the applause of a welcoming crowd and the tunes of a military band.

Near the plane, he was welcomed by Leningrad Mayor Anatoliy Sobchak, Leningrad Communist Party leader Boris Gidaspov, chairman of the Leningrad Regional Council Yuriy Yarov, commander of the Leningrad Military District Viktor Samsonov and other officials.

The guest was greeted by Chinese students studying at Leningrad educational establishments.

The state flags of China, the Soviet Union and the Russian Federation were hoisted at the airport.

Chinese statesmen and politicians, accopanying the high guest, arrived together with Jiang.

Asked by reporters how relations between the twin cities of Leningrad and Shanghai supplement state ties between the two countries, Jiang said that Leningrad and Shanghai became twin cities when he was Shanghai mayor.

"I received many proposals to visit Leningrad, but I was not able to do this in the past. I intend to pay this debt now," he noted.

The motorcade escorted by motocyclists headed for the city from the airport. Jiang visited the monument to the heroic defenders of Leningrad and its sculptural groups in the Victory Square and laid flowers.

This memorial, built in granite and bronze with people's donations, immortalised the feat of citizens and soldiers during the second world war.

Meets Leningrad Mayor

LD1805194491 Moscow TASS in English 1857 GMT 18 May 91

[By TASS correspondents Viktor Bezbrezhniy and Nikolay Kondratenko]

[Text] Leningrad May 18 TASS—Chinese Communist Party leader Jiang Zemin on Saturday arrived in Leningrad.

He met Leningrad Mayor Anatoliy Sobchak. They discussed Sino-Soviet relations and expressed hope for their positive development in future.

"We are glad to welcome the leader of a great country, with the people of which we are connected by historic ties of friendship," Sobchak said.

He noted that Leningraders are ready to grant Chinese firms and banks preferential terms to expand cooperation in various spheres of economy, science and culture.

Jiang focused on China's economic problems, including in agriculture.

He believes that stable economy ensures society's stable development. Under current conditions, the state should regulate a market, he said.

He said Sino-Soviet relations meet the interests of the Soviet and Chinese peoples. "This visit will promote mutual understanding, friendship and cooperation between our countries, Jiang said.

Meets Leningrad Party Secretary

PM2005124591 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
20 May 91 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report under the general heading: "Visit Over"]

[Text] Leningrad, 19 May—It is not only the case that the USSR and the PRC and the two countries' Communist Parties are devoted to the socialist option but also that the history of our peoples teaches us to be always together. B.V. Gidaspov, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and first secretary of Leningrad Oblast party committee, shared this conviction with Jiang Zemin, general secretary of the CPC Central Committee and chairman of the PRC Central Military Council. They had a conversation in the Smolnyy today.

The Chinese guest emphasized for his part that the meetings and talks with the Soviet leaders that have taken place during his visit have convincingly confirmed the sides' mutual desire to develop and strengthen relations of friendship and cooperation between the PRC and the USSR.

Jiang Zemin was greeted with sincere cordiality by the pupils and teachers of Leningrad's No. 5 Boarding School, which offers in-depth study of the Chinese language. The particularly deferential greeting "Nin hao!" was heard not only from the front steps, where the guest was welcomed, but also from all the open windows. Jiang Zemin was conducted around the building and shown the classrooms. He was told that the school has now been in existence for 33 years. Some of its graduates are themselves now teaching Chinese here. Of course, the normalization of Soviet-Chinese relations was warmly welcomed by everyone within these walls. The PRC Consulate General in Leningrad has given the school a set of visual aids.

The children put on a small concert in the assembly hall, performing Chinese songs and dances.

Today the guest from China also laid a wreath at the monument to the motherland in Piskarevskoye Memorial Cemetery.

Red carnations were placed at the monument to V.I. Lenin in front of the Smolnyy.

Jiang Zemin devoted part of the day to familiarizing himself with the collections in the Hermitage.

Leningrad City Soviet and Leningrad CPSU Oblast Committee gave a dinner in Jiang Zemin's honor.

In the evening the guest from the PRC left Leningrad for home. He had been in our country on an official visit at the invitation of M.S. Gorbachev, president of the USSR and general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee.

Departs for PRC

LD1905181591 Moscow TASS in English 1806 GMT
19 May 91

[Text] Leningrad May 19 TASS—Chinese Communist Party leader Jiang Zemin departed for home after his familiarisation tour of Leningrad today. He was in the Soviet Union on an official visit at the invitation of Soviet President and Communist Party leader Mikhail Gorbachev.

Sino-Soviet Communique Issued After Jiang Visit

CM2005091191 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
20 May 91 Second Edition p 5

["Joint Soviet-Chinese Communique"—PRAVDA headline]

[Text] 1. At the invitation of USSR President M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, from 15 to 19 May 1991, inclusive, Jiang Zemin, general secretary of the CPC Central Committee and chairman of the PRC Central Military Commission, was in the Soviet Union on an official visit.

M.S. Gorbachev and Jiang Zemin held an exchange of opinions in a friendly, frank, and businesslike atmosphere on the whole range of Soviet-Chinese relations and on topical international questions of mutual interest.

In the course of his visit Jiang Zemin also had meetings with A.I. Lukyanov, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet, and USSR Prime Minister V.S. Pavlov. The high-ranking Chinese guest also visited Leningrad.

2. The current meeting of the leaders of the Soviet Union and China is a continuation of the summit meeting between M.S. Gorbachev and Deng Xiaoping in May 1989. The sides highly assess the important significance of the normalization of Soviet-Chinese relations. They confirm their intention to continue in the future to

comply with the accords reached at the meeting in Beijing, and the principles set out in the joint Soviet-Chinese communique of 18 May 1989. They note with satisfaction that as a result of joint efforts, relations of friendship and cooperation between the two countries in the political, commercial, economic, scientific-technical, cultural, military, and other fields are developing steadily.

Taking a solicitous view of what has already been achieved, the sides express the readiness to further develop friendly, good-neighbor, and mutually beneficial cooperation, which is not only in keeping with the interests and aspirations of the peoples of both countries, but also promotes the preservation of peace and stability throughout the world.

3. The strengthening ties between the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Chinse Communist Party play an important role in the package of Soviet-Chinese relations. The past two years have confirmed the usefulness of the exchange of information and opinions and of party work experience in contemporary conditions. Interparty contacts will continue to be implemented in accordance with the principles of autonomy, full equality, mutual respect, and noninterference in each other's internal affairs.

4. The Soviet Union and China positively assess the growth in the scale and increase in the forms of bilateral commercial and economic links. In the economic sphere, both sides supplement each other. There is considerable potential for cooperation. They will continue to apply efforts to implement the long-term program of economic, scientific, and technical cooperation and other agreements in this sphere; to bring about the expansion of comprehensive and mutually advantageous cooperation; to develop direct and border links between the republics, krays, oblasts, and enterprises of the Soviet Union and the provinces, autonomous regions, cities, and enterprises of China; and to guarantee the support of the central bodies. Trade with settlements in freely convertible currency will be developed and support will be given to all of its forms which are adopted in world practice. The sides will carry out an active search for new ways and means of economic partnership, including possibilities of cooperation with third countries in the implementation of various economic projects.

The sides intend to carry out a broad exchange of economic, scientific, and technical information, and experience regarding economic transformation. Joint efforts aimed at further raising the efficiency of commercial and economic cooperation between the Soviet Union and China on the basis of equality and mutual benefit will be continued.

5. The USSR and the PRC will facilitate contacts between citizens and will implement exchanges and cooperation among legislative bodies, ministries and departments, and public organizations. They will apply their efforts to further development of scientific and cultural exchanges and contacts in education, sports, and other spheres.

The sides agree to facilitate exchanges and cooperation in the juridical sphere and to draw up and conclude an agreement on legal assistance in civil and criminal cases. The responsible bodies in the USSR and PRC will act together in countering organized crime, international terrorism, and illegal drug and contraband traffiking, as well as other unlawful activities. The forms and methods of cooperation in this sphere will be discussed separately.

6. The sides affirm positive advances in talks on a border settlement between the two states. They note the need to enshrine the results achieved in the form of a legally binding treaty. They welcome the signing of the agreement on the eastern section of the Soviet-Chinese border. In keeping with the spirit of the joint Soviet-Chinese communique of 18 May 1989, both sides will intensively continue talks on the areas still not agreed, in order to achieve a just and rational resolution of the border issues that have historically existed between them.

The sides note that the "Agreement on Guiding Principles for Mutual Reduction of Armed Forces and Confidence-Building in the Military Sphere in the area of the Soviet-Chinese Border," which has been signed at government level by both countries, makes a positive contribution to the preservation of calm and stability in the border region and facilitates the strengthening of mutual trust between the two countries.

The sides confirm their readiness to continue to actively hold talks with a view to achieving practical results.

The sides state that normal, friendly contacts will be maintained between the Armed Forces of the two countries.

7. The Chinese side confirms that the government of the People's Republic of China is the only legitimate government representing the whole of China. Taiwan is an inalienable part of the territory of the PRC. The Chinese side is resolutely against any attempts or actions aimed at creating "two Chinas," "one China and one Taiwan," "one country with two governments," or "an independent Taiwan."

The Soviet Union supports this position of the PRC.

8. The leaders of the USSR and the PRC briefed each other on the contemporary political and socio-economic situations in their countries. They think that the practice of regularly exchanging opinions on these questions is useful. Some differences in the sides' views and methods of actions are natural, but do not hinder the normal development of bilateral relations.

The sides note that it is difficult for socialism as a new social system to avoid complexities and contradiction in its development. Proceeding from the real state of affairs existing in both countries, they think that reforms, an important condition of which is the maintenance of stability in the state and society, are necessary to reveal the potential of socialism. There are no universal patterns for carrying out reforms or for implementing perestroyka. Each people has the right to decide autonomously the affairs of its own country in keeping with its concrete conditions.

9. M.S. Gorbachev provided information on the efforts being undertaken to preserve the Soviet Union as a renewed federation of sovereign republics, and on the forthcoming signing of the new Union treaty. Understanding was expressed on the Chinese side for the importance of a positive solution to this problem.

10. The leaders of the USSR and the PRC exchanged views regarding key points of today's international situation. They consider that the improvement in Soviet-U.S. relations, the progress made in the sphere of disarmament, and the settlement of certain regional conflicts or the emergence of prospects for a political settlement of them represent positive changes in world affairs. At the same time, the sides note that under the conditions of an intertwining of various contradictions, the situation in the world is far from one of stability. Anxiety is aroused also by unjust international economic relations, in particular the widening of the gap between the developing and the developed states, the exacerbation of the debt problem, and the worsening conditions for world trade.

The sides will continue to foster the process of normalization of the world situation, of arms reductions, and of the settlement of regional conflicts. They affirm that neither the USSR nor the PRC claims hegemony in the world, and they are against any manifestations of hegemonism in international politics.

11. The Soviet Union and China attach great importance to the deepening of good-neighbor relations, of multifaceted cooperation, and of security and stability in the Asia-Pacific region, which is favorable for peace and for the development of all countries of the region and of the world as a whole.

In the past few years certain positive changes have taken place here. At the same time, there are destabilizing factors operating in the region. Hot spots and unsettled conflicts exist. The sides are convinced that political and economic issues affecting the common interests of the countries of the Asia-Pacific region should be solved by means of political dialogue and equitable consultations.

The USSR and PRC are ready to apply joint efforts to turn the Asia-Pacific region into a zone of openness, cooperation, and prosperity.

12. The sides express the hope for an early, all-round, just, and rational solution to the Cambodian problem. They consider that the framework documents of the five permanent members of the UN Security Council are a good foundation for the achievement of an all-embracing political settlement in Cambodia. The sides support the efforts of the cochairmen of the international Paris conference on Cambodia and the UN secretary general, and they urge all the Cambodian sides to achieve accord at the earliest possible time on an all-embracing settlement on the basis of the above documents.

13. The Soviet Union and China consider that relaxation of the situation on the Korean peninsula is of important significance for security and stability in Northeast Asia. The sides welcome the positive changes that have taken place of late on the Korean peninsula, and reaffirm their support for the implementation of the peaceful unification of Korea by means of dialogue and consultations between North and South. They express the hope that the North and the South will continue the dialogue for the purpose of further improving mutual relations, and urge all interested sides to refrain from any actions hampering detente on the peninsula and the peaceful unification of Korea.

14. The sides are observing with deep concern the development of events in the Persian Gulf and in the Near East area as a whole. They consider it essential that the consequences of the recent conflict in the Persian Gulf be overcome as soon as possible. The sides assume that the affairs of that region should be resolved mainly by the countries and peoples there, by way of talks.

The USSR and the PRC are uneasy over the fact that the Near East problem remains unresolved. The international community, in particular the United Nations, should play a more active role in establishing peace and stability in that region, and should take practical measures for the fulfillment of UN resolutions on the Near East problem, with the aim of achieving a just and lasting settlement. In their capacity as permanent members of the UN Security Council, both sides intend to continue exerting efforts aimed at an all-embracing settlement in the Near East, to include the solution of the Palestinian problem.

15. The sides note that the achievement and practical implementation of accords at Soviet-U.S. talks on reducing strategic offensive weapons would be of positive significance for strengthening security in the world and would lay the foundation for further measures leading ultimately to the total and universal elimination of nuclear weapons. They favor the earliest possible conclusion of the drafting of a convention for universal prohibition and total destruction of chemical weapons, the strengthening of the procedures of the convention banning biological weapons, and the attainment of an accord on keeping space free of all types of weaponry.

16. The Soviet Union and China are in favor of strengthening the role of the United Nations in creating peaceful conditions for the life of the peoples and of providing guarantees for the stability and security of states. As permanent members of the UN Security Council, they intend, together with other states, to assist in raising the efficiency of the organization and to further the playing

by the United Nations of a more active role in international affairs and in solving economic, social, demographic, ecological, and other global problems.

17. The sides spoke out in favor of the establishment of a new and just international political and economic order that would meet the interests of the development of mankind and of peace in the whole world, and meet the common aspirations of the peoples of all countries.

Such an order could be based upon the universal principles of interstate relations: the mutual respect for state sovereignty and territorial integrity, nonaggression, noninterference in each others' internal affairs, equality, mutual benefit, and peaceful coexistence.

All countries have the right to choose their social system, ideology, economic model, and path of development in accordance with their specific characteristics. Differences in this respect should not hamper normal relations and cooperation between them. All states—regardless of whether they are large or small, strong or weak, rich or poor—have an equal right to participate in discussing and in deciding world affairs.

International disputes are resolved by means of peace talks; diktat, and the use of military force or the threat of force, are impermissible in relations between states.

In the interests of joint development and prosperity, all states implement economic ties on the basis of equality and mutual benefit, and build fair international economic relations. The granting of aid should not be accompanied by political conditions.

The establishment of a new international order is a long and complicated process. It presupposes the active participation of all members of the world community, respect for the UN Charter, and the observance of the generally accepted norms of international law.

The Soviet Union and China express their readiness to continue to make efforts together with all states of the world to institute a new world order.

18. The Soviet and Chinese leaders highly appraise the results of the meeting. They expressed satisfaction that a new page is being opened in relations between the Soviet Union and the People's Republic of China, between the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Chinese Communist Party, and the traditional friendship between the peoples of the two countries.

The sides are unanimous that the political contacts and the dialogue between the leaders of the two countries are important and useful, and that they will be continued.

Jiang Zemin expressed sincere gratitude for the warm welcome accorded him by the Soviet side. He invited M.S. Gorbachev to visit China at a time convenient to him.

M.S. Gorbachev accepted this invitation with thanks.

[Dated] Moscow, 19 May 1991

IZVESTIYA Reports Jiang-Pavlov Talks

PM1705154991 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 18 May 91 Union Edition p 5

[Article by V. Ganshin: "USSR-PRC: Agreement on Border"]

[Text] At a briefing held 16 May at the USSR Foreign Ministry Press Center Wu Jianmin, chief of the PRC Foreign Ministry Information Department, briefed Soviet and foreign journalists on day two of the visit to our country by Jiang Zemin, general secretary of the CPC Central Committee and chairman of the PRC Central Military Council.

Jiang Zemin had another meeting in the Kremlin with USSR President M.S. Gorbachev, who made a high assessment of the previous day's talks with the lofty Chinese guest. The fruitfulness of the current dialogue on bilateral ties, Jiang Zemin noted, is the result of the successful May 1989 summit in China. It has made it possible, figuratively speaking, to "close the door on the past and open the door to the future" in relations between the two countries. Despite the fluctuations in the international political situation, the sides stated that bilateral relations have stood the test of time. Practice has shown that friendly and good-neighborly relations between China and the Soviet Union based on the five principles of peaceful coexistence are the optimum choice for the two countries and the two peoples. The task now is to further develop these ties and mutually advantageous cooperation in the most varied areas. In this connection regular contacts and exchanges of opinions between the leaders of the two countries are of great importance.

The 16 May signing of the agreement on the eastern section of the state border between the USSR and the PRC was a great event. Both sides, it was noted at the briefing, expressed readiness, in accordance with the spirit of the Soviet-Chinese joint communique of 1989, to continue talks on outstanding border issues in order to settle them in the very near future. As for talks on reciprocal armed forces cuts in the border area, the sides expressed the hope that progress would also be achieved through mutual consultations.

On behalf of the PRC chairman and the State Council premier, Jiang Zemin gave M.S. Gorbachev an invitation to visit China. The invitation was gratefully accepted.

During the afternoon the lofty Chinese guest met with A.I. Lukyanov, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet, and USSR Prime Minister V.S. Pavlov. During the talks questions of interparliamentary ties were discussed and the great importance of exchanging experience of the work of the supreme USSR and Chinese organs of power was noted. Jiang Zemin talked about the implementation of reform in China, and the existing system in the country of consulting with democratic parties and organizations functioning under CPC leadership.

During Jiang Zemin's meeting with V.S. Pavlov the Soviet and PRC interest in deepening and developing trade and economic cooperation was stressed, taking account of the great potential of the two countries' opportunities and the complementary nature of the Chinese and Soviet economies. Although trade turnover between the countries in 1990 amounted to more than 3 billion rubles in gross terms, in per capita terms this indicator was not so significant.

Our country, as V.S. Pavlov put it, is studying with great attention the Chinese experience of reform, which combines planning principles with a regulated market mechanism. Jiang Zemin briefed the Soviet side in detail on the work being done in the country under the CPC's leadership to find the optimum solution for the coexistence of public and other forms of ownership of means of production. Our aim, he said is to build socialism with a Chinese face.

At the end of the briefing Comrade Wu Jianmin answered journalists' questions.

Commentaries View Results of Jiang Zemin Visit

'New Model' of Relations Established

PM1905191391 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 20 May 91 First Edition p 6

[Unattributed "Editorial Commentary": "Back to the Future"]

[Text] This week Soviet-Chinese relations were the main topic of conversation everywhere. Exactly two years after the meeting in Beijing which "brought the past to a close and opened up the future," the top leaders of the two neighboring socialist states have met again, in Moscow. The joint Soviet-Chinese communique, published in PRAVDA today, is a new milestone in the annals of our bilateral relations.

What have the two years since the Beijing summit been marked by? Above all, perhaps, by the stabilizing influence of the normalization of Soviet-Chinese relations on the situation inside our countries, on the Asian-Pacific region, and on the world situation as a whole. Fears that rapprochement between Moscow and Beijing might be detrimental to someone else have proved groundless. In fact, it was the catalyst for the renewal of our societies and a major positive factor of international life.

The events of the past two years have not only tested the strength of the new links between Moscow and Beijing. They have made people ponder the fact that without stability in the Soviet Union there can be no stability in Europe; without stability in China there can be no stability in Asia; without normal relations between our states, one of which has no equal in terms of territory and the other in terms of population, there can be no stability in the world.

The cornerstone of the foundation of Soviet-Chinese relations is mutual trust. And this is the product of mutual understanding, the quickest way to which is meetings between top leaders. Now a regular feature, they are particularly valuable at a time when both our countries are going through a difficult transitional period, when it is necessary to compare successes and failures and ways of overcoming similar difficulties and obstacles.

Experience of renewing socialism in such immense multinational states as the Soviet Union and China shows that the process can be successful if, while remaining revolutionary in essence, it is implemented by constructive, evolutionary methods. Attempts to change the face of a vast country at a stroke, by means of "major changes" or "great leaps forward" lead to no good. The Moscow meeting participants stressed that the preservation of sociopolitical stability is an essential condition of successful reforms.

The stabilizing effect of the normalization of Soviet-Chinese relations on the regional and global political climate is only just beginning to be felt. But in one respect it is obvious right away: Both the two neighboring peoples have the feeling that they have a safe and secure rear. The agreement signed during the Moscow meeting on the eastern sector of the state border between the USSR and the PRC, like last year's accord on the guidelines for the mutual reduction of armed forces in border areas, opens up the prospect of making the world's longest land border a frontier of good-neighborliness. This not only enables our peoples to make considerable resources available for creative needs, but is also the first real step toward military detente in the Asian-Pacific region and a good example to others.

Both the just-ended visit to the USSR by China's top leader—the first since 1957—and the first-ever visit to Japan by the head of our state, which took place a month before, are very importance advances in the Eastern sphere of Soviet foreign policy. Let us say that the experience accumulated by Moscow and Beijing of solving such delicate problems as a border settlement on the basis of a balance of interests could be of value for relations between Moscow and Tokyo. China and Japan are our great Far Eastern neighbors. Mutual understanding and collaboration with them are of key significance for peace and stability in Asia.

The meetings between our states' top leaders in Beijing and Moscow show that the normalization of Soviet-Chinese relations is not a return to the past, to the allied ties of the fifties. It is the birth of a qualitatively new model of relations, enabling the two biggest socialist states to move more confidently forward, toward the 21st century. Figuratively speaking, it is back to the future.

'Enormous Potential' for Improved Ties

OW1805213691 Moscow Radio Moscow in Mandarin 1000 GMT 18 May 91

[Commentary by (Kandrasheyev); from the "Current Events and Commentaries" program]

[Text] Jiang Zemin, general secretary of the CPC Central Committee and chairman of the Chinese Central Military Commission, has concluded the official part of his visit to the Soviet Union. The visit was a success, as can be observed from reports about the summit at the Kremlin. The following is an article by station commentator (Kandrasheyev) in this connection. He writes:

We can say without the least exaggeration that there is still enormous potential for the development and improvement of relations between the neighboring countries of the Soviet Union and China. This being the case, I want to raise another question: What new aspects of Sino-Soviet cooperation might have been mentioned during the Moscow summit? We must understand that the specific and primary issue discussed during the summit was the future of bilateral relations.

Prior to the discussion of prospects for cooperation, the leaders of the two countries certainly examined the development of relations since Gorbachev's May 1989 visit to China. Both sides were satisfied with the rapid development of relations in many areas. While the scope of cooperation has been very extensive, ranging from political, economic, scientific, and cultural areas to relations between the two parties, I think that restoration of trust and mutual understanding in the political sphere is the main success achieved by the two parties in developing relations. People believe that, without this trust and mutual understanding, the Soviet Union and China would not have been able to develop their ties to present levels in such a short time.

General Secretary Jiang Zemin observed that development of Sino-Soviet relations has never enjoyed such smooth sailing as it does now. Apparently, it is specifically trust and mutual understanding that have created conditions under which both sides might settle previously unresolved issues, for example the border issue. The accord on the eastern border signed during the visit is also invaluable [nan yi gu jia] for relaxing the military situation in border areas. This highly complex issue, which remains to be resolved, has caused tension not only between these two countries but in many parts of the world for many years. We must realize that our two nuclear powers were confronting one another.

I would like to briefly discuss the new direction of Sino-Soviet cooperation. The summit raised the point that efforts should be made to stabilize Sino-Soviet cooperation on a broad basis for a long time to come, and that relations and cooperation should be developed and broadened in certain new areas, such as nuclear power generation, [words indistinct] manufacturing, aerospace, and other scientific areas between regional departments as well as central departments, thus substantially expanding bilateral cooperation.

International issues were also discussed during the summit. It was pointed out emphatically at the meeting that the development of Sino-Soviet relations is not directed against any third country. Gorbachev said that the current state of Sino-Soviet relations constitutes an important factor ensuring international stability.

Commentator (Kandrasheyev) concludes: Sino-Soviet cooperation has reached a new and higher level both from the perspective of bilateral relations and that of international relations.

Meeting Stresses Domestic Stability

OW1905062691 Moscow Radio Moscow in Mandarin 0700 GMT 17 May 91

[Commentary by Nikolayev]

[Text] During the Sino-Soviet talks held in Mosocw, Gorbachev and Jiang Zemin stressed the need to maintain domestic stability from both a regional and a global perspective. Our station commentator Nikolayev points out:

It is understandable for Moscow and Beijing to have an identical viewpoint on this issue. The social revitalization and reform being pursued by the two countries are extremely important undertakings. They are important not only because they are vital to our own future, but also because reform in large countries like the Soviet Union and China will have an effect on the world surrounding them.

The call for development in the Soviet Union and China recently has become the most important factor in accelerating the normalization of Soviet-Chinese relations. The domestic political policies implemented by the two countries' former leaders led to a rapid deterioration of bilateral relations. The consequences of this deterioration for the entire international community are well known.

The normalization of Soviet-Chinese relations and the establishment of a foundation on which stable and sound relations can be built have borne fruit very rapidly. The two countries no longer need to spend a tremendous amount of manpower and materials to confront one another. On the contrary, they can devote more energy to solving their domestic problems. At the same time, a dangerous hot spot in Asia and for the entire world has disappeared, and the watershed dividing the opposing camps of Moscow and Beijing has been completely dismantled.

Increasing Soviet-Chinese cooperation in the political field has opened up a real prospect for solving regional conflicts and for stabilizing the political situation. The Soviet Union and China have taken similar action to reduce their armed forces and to promote mutual trust in the border regions. Incidentally, the border agreement signed on 16 May in Moscow will further strengthen the good-neighborly relations between the two countries. Who knows, maybe this experience will provide a valuable lesson for countries in the Asia-Pacific region in easing political and military tension and formulating multilateral policies.

I would also like to mention one other important point: The normalization of Soviet-Chinese relations has not caused damage to other countries in Asia or to other parts of the world. On the contrary, everyone has benefited from it, as reflected in the improved situation in the Asia-Pacific region. As Gorbachev emphatically pointed out during the welcoming luncheon held at the Kremlin for Chinese leader Jiang Zemin, present Sino-Soviet relations are an important factor in stabilizing the world situation in general.

Sino-Soviet 'Horizons' Expanded

LD1905142591 Moscow Radio Moscow World Service in English 1210 GMT 19 May 91

[Unattributed commentary]

[Text] The official visit to the Soviet Union by the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China, Jiang Zemin, attracted much attention in the world because there has been no similar thing for over 30 years, since 1957 when Mao Zedong visited Moscow. Then a period of tension followed which clouded not only the relationships between the two countries but also many things in the international arena. Two years ago Mikhail Gorbachev visited China, the Soviet-Chinese talks were followed by the normalization of the two countries relations. It was announced in Beijing that the two countries managed to close the past and open the future.

The recent talks in Moscow between Jiang Zemin and Mikhail Gorbachev have become a continuation of the Beijing summit meeting. The talks were fruitful and promoted mutual understanding, such was the appreciation by the guest. We, he said about the Chinese and the Soviet side, have expressed satisfaction by the fact that over these two years the relations between the two countries and the two parties are developing on a stable basis. We are unanimous in believing that there is a great potential and broad perspectives for exchanges and cooperation between China and the Soviet Union in all spheres. We are glad the success of this visit has been complete, stressed Jiang Zemin in his television address on Friday. Speaking about the results of the recent talks, he pointed to the strengthening of mutual understanding between the two countries, and here it seems is the main achievement of the two states in promoting their relationships.

It is quite evident that confidence and mutual understanding have conditioned the bilateral steps to eliminate problems inherited from the recent difficult time. One of these problems is the border settlement. During the Moscow visit the sides have signed an agreement on the Soviet-Chinese state border in its eastern part. The sides voiced confidence that if they continue working in the same spirit of friendly consultation they will manage to reach an agreement to settle other common border problems.

It's worth while pointing now at another aspect of the recent summit talks. The sides have admitted as expedient to attach a broad, stable and lasting character to the cooperation between the Soviet Union and China. The countries will develop contacts in new spheres: in the atomic energy, civil aircraft construction, in outer space exploration, and in other science-based industries. The countries will also expand contacts in many other spheres. They will cooperate both on the central and regional levels. In this way the horizons of the friendly contacts useful for both sides will greatly expand.

During the talks the sides naturally considered international issues. They stated that there are many close and similar points in the positions of both countries. They especially stresed that the development of the ties between the Soviet Union and China is not aimed against any third country. Mikhail Gorbachev said that the modern Soviet-Chinese relations were an important stabilizing factor in the international relations.

In short, both in the sphere of the bilateral relations and in the international plane, the Soviet-Chinese cooperation is apparently reaching a qualitatively new level.

USSR-PRC 'Learning From Each Other'

OW2005121391 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1800 GMT 17 May 91

[From "Diplomatic Panorama"]

[Text] A political analyst for the Communist Paty daily PRAVDA, Mr Vsevolod Ovchinnikov, believes that the recent meeting between the general secretaries of the Soviet and Chinese communist parties is part of traditional summits between two large nations. In an interview with a DP [Diplomatic Panorama] correspondent Mr Ovchinnikov gave his own assessment of the state of bilateral relations following normalization of two years ago which were put to a serious trial-test.

The 1989 tragic events in Beijing and the hardships of Soviet reform have caused a mixed response in both countries. Nonetheless, said Mr Ovchinnikov, the two countries remained committed to the letter and spirit of the joint communique they signed two years ago. More importantly, he says, Moscow and Beijing have stopped teaching each other but begun learning from each other instead.

Mr Ovchinnikov points to the significance of trade relations between the USSR and China. Although its level is far above the best indicators of the 1950s, he says, "there is no cause for rejoice." China's trade with the Soviet Union jumped 14-fold in 1980s but is still a mere 4

of its trade with the rest of the world. However, unlike its trade with Japan, China's trade links with the Soviet UNion are mutually complementary. Significantly, China's recent offer of a $730m easy-term credit for Soviet imports of goods is its first to another country.

Mr Ovchinnikov believes that the two countries' adherence to the communique mentioned about helped promote cooperation even in a delicate area such as party-to-party contracts. He says the mistakes made by the two countries' ruling parties and governments in embracing reform were surprisingly similar. Therefore, the more we learn about each other's failures and mistakes, the better, he says.

But the main result of bilateral normalization, says Mr Ovchinnikov, is that the Soviet Union and China no longer worry about their common border, the world's longest, now that the prospect has emerged for turning it into one of peace and friendship which will help them do away with the expensive military confrontation as an initial step to defusing tensions in Asia and the Pacific.

On bilateral military cooperation, Mr Ovchinnikov said that part of Soviet weapons now being removed from Eastern Europe to be deployed beyond the Urals may be sold to China because of Moscow's reluctance to overbuild its military presence in the country's Asian part, and of the difficulties it may have in storing them there.

On possible contacts between the USSR and Taiwan and the way these are likely to affect relations between Moscow and Beijing, Mr Ovchinnikov says the Soviet Union must abide by the main principle [word indistinct] Beijing saying there is one China and Taiwan is one of its provinces with which economic contacts can be promoted on an inter-regional basis alone. For its part, China must not discriminate against Moscow more than it does against Japan or the United States which are committed to follow that principle under relevant agreements with China.

U.S.'Two China' Policy Denounced

OW2005021691 Moscow Radio Moscow in Mandarin 1000 GMT 19 May 91

[Commentary by Alekseyev]

[Text] Listeners: China firmly opposes any attempt to create two Chinas. Jiang Zemin, general secretary of the CPC Central Committee, made this remark at the Moscow talks. The Soviet side expressed its support for this Chinese position.

Station observer Alekseyev says: In the past people attempted to create two Chinas or one China and one Taiwan. Some people are still attempting to do this now. There are some officials in the Washington government who seek this. The Soviet Union denounces [qianze 6232 6307] this attempt.

There is only one China, with its capital in Beijing. Taiwan is an inalienable part of China, which is obvious as far as the Soviet Union is concerned. Neither the West nor the East has had any reason to doubt this in the 40-odd years since the founding of the PRC.

I would like to stress this fact: Soviet-Chinese relations were strained in the past, but the Soviet Union never changed its principled stand on the Taiwan issue. For example, in the late 1960's, the Soviet Union firmly objected to Taiwan representing China in the United Nations and strove to restore China's legitimate rights in that international organization.

An American historian said: This Soviet position to a considerable extent forced the United States to agree to restore the UN seat to China.

In making the above remarks, I have only one object in mind; namely, the Soviet Union has never sought to take any expedient measures regarding the Taiwan issue. As far as we are concerned, this is a matter of principle.

Finally, I wish to emphatically point out: The Soviet Union sympathizes with and understands China's policy in developing economic and other relations with Taiwan. We firmly believe that this policy is conducive to gradually creating conditions for the peaceful reunification of China.

Northeast Asia

Deputies, ROK Legislators Discuss Bilateral Ties

PM1705153991 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 15 May 91 Union Edition p5

[TASS report: "In the Interests of Two Countries' Peoples"]

[Text] For the Soviet and ROK parliaments, May this year is, without exaggeration, a historic landmark: Contacts between the USSR Supreme Soviet and ROK National Assembly have begun on a permanent basis for the first time. USSR President M.S. Gorbachev's recent visit to the ROK is responsible to a decisive extent for giving the "green light" to the development of bilateral relations, including at the parliamentary level. This was stressed during a conversation on 13 May between a delegation of South Korean legislators and their Soviet colleagues in the USSR Supreme Soviet International Affairs Committee.

The discussion was businesslike from the very outset. In particular, the sides agreed that both parliaments will form associations of deputies responsible for ties between the Soviet and ROK supreme legislative bodies. We should point out that this proposal came from the

South Korean parliamentarians. As International Affairs Committee Chairman A.S. Dzasokhov stressed, the formation of associations responsible for parliamentary ties in the USSR and South Korea will be conducive to the implementation of accords reached between the two countries' presidents.

Pak Chun-kyu, head of the delegation and chairman of the ROK National Assembly, said that the processes of transformation taking place in our country are also very important for the South Korean state. The Western press writes a great deal about the difficulties being experienced in the Soviet Union, he said, but I am sure they will be overcome.

The guest expressed the opinion—with which his Soviet interlocutors agreed—that the USSR and South Korea will also find a considerable number of common interests in the political sphere, particularly in the Asia-Pacific region.

On the same day the ROK National Assembly delegation laid a wreath at the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier by the Kremlin wall.

Pardoned DPRK 'Hijacker' Interviewed

PM2105101191 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 17 May 91 p 3

[Report by correspondent S. Ivanov, incorporating interview with Kim Hyon-hee, DPRK citizen convicted in Seoul in 1988 for aircraft hijacking [as published], in Seoul; date of interview not given: "The 116th passenger—'I Was Told That the Order To Blow Up the Boeing Came From the Beloved Leader'"]

[Text] Seoul-Moscow—The elevator stopped without a sound halfway up the Tower. Five burly guys, dressed in the uniform of Tower staff, asked me to wait. The Tower is a smart hotel in the heart of Seoul. In a few minutes' time I was due to interview in one of the hotel rooms a woman whose name was never off the front pages of Western newspapers a few years ago.

...On 29 November 1987 a Boeing-707 belonging to the South Korean airline was flying the Baghdad-Abu Dhabi-Seoul route. Contact with the aircraft was suddenly lost near the Thailand border.

Ten days' search in impenetrable jungles produced no results. The official assumption was that the plane had plunged from a great height into the Andaman Sea. There were 115 persons on board.

Air services representatives claimed that the four-engine Boeing had been blown up. Otherwise the pilot would have managed to either land or notify ground services of any faults on board.

Suspicions of a possible terrorist attack were reinforced following the detention of a father and daughter of Asian origin traveling around the world. It emerged that they had been passengers... on the first leg of the missing aircraft's flight. The pair boarded another plane in Abu Dhabi, heading for Manama, the capital of Bahrain, where they were arrested while attempting to board a flight to Rome.

During the first interrogation, the suspects took poison which had been concealed in the filters of Japanese cigarettes. Informed sources claim that father and daughter held forged Japanese passports in the name of Shinichi Hachiya, aged 69, and Mayumi Hachiya, aged 27.

Shinichi Hachiya died within a few hours. His companion was taken to hospital. Her life was not in danger.

A trial took place in Seoul 7 March 1988. The case investigation material contained the testimony of Kim Hyon-hee—who actually was posing as Mayumi—and fragments of the plane which a Thai fisherman fished up from the bottom of the sea. The investigation established that Kim Khen Khi and her companion had left a powerful, timer-operated explosive device behind them on the South Korean plane.

...And so, the closed door of the hotel room tightly guarded by employees of the National Security Planning Agency [NSPA]—the Korean CIA—in plain clothes. Behind the door waits Kim Hyon-hee.

A traditional Korean greeting. She speaks very softly, barely audibly, telling her story. From time to time she strokes the snow-white tablecloth with hands that are wrinkled like an old woman's. Her face has beautiful, regular Asiatic features.

[Ivanov] You have become a Catholic. Does it help?

[Kim Hyon-hee] When I lived in North Korea, I knew nothing of religion. You know, religion is considered to be something bad over there. When I realized what I had done, I suffered terribly. The investigators gave me a bible. For the first time I held in my hands the holy book, and I understood nothing in it. A pastor came to me and began to explain each word.

[Ivanov] What was the goal of your terrorist act?

[Text] [Kim Hyon-hee] Our action, as I was told, was supposed to prevent the Olympic Games being held in Seoul. I was told that the order had come from Kim Chong-il himself—the son of the great leader. However, I never saw that order, I was only told of it. At the same time, I was also told that the action's ultimate goal was the unification of the country.

[Ivanov] When was the last time you saw your mother?

[Kim Hyon-hee] It was 12 November 1987, when I left Pyongyang. I do not know what has happened to my parents since then.

[Ivanov] When and why did you decide to testify?

[Kim Hyon-hee] When I was being trained for the terrorist act in North Korea, I was often told about the tortures here. But it turned out to be the exact opposite. I have been treated humanely. Moreover, I became friends with the woman investigator who accompanied me from Bahrain. Even now we are seldom apart. She is like an elder sister to me.

What I knew about South Korea while living in the North differed markedly from what I have actually seen. The people here lead a prosperous life, in spite of what I was told over there. But there I was like a child—I believed everything.

[Ivanov] Your death sentence has been quashed on the president's order and you have been restored to freedom. What brought this about?

[Kim Hyon-hee] I was stunned when my death penalty was quashed. I am very grateful to the government of this country. I think that the reason why it was repealed is that I am the only person who knows the whole truth. And my task now is to convince everyone that I really am a Northerner. Because people in the DPRK, and indeed here in the South as well, do not particularly believe that. This is why I have started writing my memoirs, however difficult it is for me to relive everything again.

[Ivanov] You are tightly guarded. Whose vengeance do you fear?

[Kim Hyon-hee] While I am still in danger of vengeance from North Korea, I need an escort. And then, I cannot cope in this society, I do not know what to do or where to go. I need constant looking after. But I am trying to adapt to the new society. [Kim Hyon-hee ends]

The time of the interview was up. Three kids, already in waiters' uniform, brought us a small glass of juice each and stood in line. The conversation took on an official character, moving into the phase when it remains only to offer one's thanks for the interview, and tender one's best wishes.

A traditional Korean bow. That is all; curtain. She left the Tower Hotel room, which had been hired for the day by the Korean CIA especially for this meeting...

The Kim Hyon-hee affair is extremely intricate. Doubts about the "North Korean trail" have been expresses on numerous occasions at various levels. It has been said that during one press conference she used expressions only used by indigenous inhabitants of the South. The story as regards her father is not clear either—he was allegedly a diplomat in a Southeast Asian country. The DPRK Foreign Ministry denies that it had such an employee on its staff.

Unfortunately, it may be said: It is a thing of the past. Unfortunately for her, because all her future life is a thing of the past. A cog in the battle between the forces of right and wrong. "I was like a child in North Korea... my task was simply to press the button..." Three turning points in fate: The first was when her touch set the timing device ticking; the second was the capsule with the cyanide drop which failed to fully penetrate her organism; and the third—two weeks later, when she started testifying. "Now I am like a child in this country..." A 30-year-old child. The 116th passenger of the downed Boeing.

Stop Press

REUTER reports that Japanese officials have been trying to trace Dakuchi Yeyoko [name as transliterated], the Japanese woman who was Kim Hyon-hee's instructor. A South Korean NSPA spokesman informed journalists at a press conference that Dakuchi Yeyoko was kidnapped by the North Korean Special Services in a Tokyo suburb in 1978.

During the investigation conducted in 1988, Kim Hyon-hee confessed that her training for the terrorist act was handled by a 35-year-old woman of Japanese origin, who taught her typically Japanese habits and manners, the NSPA spokesman said.

Japanese To Visit Relatives' Graves in USSR

OW2105043791 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1900 GMT 20 May 91

[Text] In mid-June about 200 citizens of Japan will be coming to Siberia for the first time ever to visit the places where their relatives, who had died in captivity in the Soviet Union following the Second World War, are buried. The camps for the Japanese prisoners of war were located around the town of Taishet and in the upper reaches of the Lena river, where they were building a number of facilities of the Trans-Siberian railway.

According to a Japanese-Soviet agreement, a three-hour ritual ceremony is to be held at the sites of the burials.

Near East & South Asia

Bessmertnykh Comments on Recent Mideast Tour

LD1805215991 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 1500 GMT 18 May 91

[Interview with USSR Foreign Minister A.A. Bessmertnykh, by political observer Viktor Lyubovtsev on airplane en route to Moscow on 15 May; from the "International Panorama" program presented by Stanislav Kondrashov—recorded]

[Text] [Kondrashov] Recently our foreign minister returned from a trip to the Near East. En route to Moscow, he gave an interview to Viktor Lyubovtsev, political observer for Central Television.

[Lyubovtsev] Under the wing of the airplane is stony desert, infrequent towns, and unending sand. A land scorched by the sun and seared by wars. This is the Near East. Over recent decades the fire of war has flared up five times here between neighbors—Israel and the Arab countries. They have one land, a common historical homeland, and the cradle of a great ancient civilization.

How can peace be achieved? What should be done so that finally the Near East ceases to be a trouble spot and center of the fires of war and turns into a source of goodneighborliness and cooperation for all who live here? The trip by the USSR foreign minister to this region was to assist in searching for a real answer to these questions. On his way home to Moscow, Aleksandr Bessmertnykh spoke about his trip. [video shows desert from a plane, Lyubovtsev interviewing Bessmertnykh]

Aleksandr Aleksandrovich, in the course of this trip you visited five Near East countries. You also visited Geneva, where you had a meeting with Yasir 'Arafat. You have 15,000 km behind you, even a little more. All this in one week. What caused such a tight schedule for your journey and, the main thing, to what extent has it justified the effort spent and your expectations?

[Bessmertnykh] You know, it was an urgent trip. It was a trip connected with the resolution of the serious tasks that we set ourselves, both as a country and as the cochairman or co-initiator of a future peace conference on the Near East. I would put it this way: The benefit from the trip is exceptional. That is, we have at long last started working with the Near East as we should, that is, in a concrete way, absolutely specifically, attempting to coordinate all interests, if at all possible.

With regard to the results themselves, practically all countries of the region have been involved. They are all talking about the necessity of new perameters of negotiations and new quests for peace in the region, albeit with various degrees of willingness and preparedness. There is a feeling of weariness among the peoples of the region, due to this confrontation which has been going on for so long and which gives nothing to anyone.

Everyone is weary—both the Arabs and the Israelis. They are all thirsting for change. At last we have an approach involving a variety of measures and plans. Now we are dealing with absolutely everybody. Before, we had camps. American diplomacy did not deal with one camp, while Soviet diplomacy did not deal with the other camp. Instead of uniting, sometimes, perhaps unintentionally, we disunited the participants in the process.

Now we are dealing with everyone. The Soviet Union is conducting talks with all the Arabs, with the Palestinians and with Israel. We know everyone's point of view, which is the main thing. All the states and representatives, without exception, are in favor of the Soviet Union's role. By the way, I consider this to be one of the extremely positive factors. Everyone told us this. We are in favor of the active role of the Soviet Union. Everyone is grateful that, without grudging its efforts, the Soviet Union has embarked on precisely this task.

Many difficulties remain. I do not want to mislead anyone. There are enormous difficulties. We will still have to work very hard. Moreover, the difficulties are not only of a technical nature. You and I have talked quite a lot about them. Nonetheless, stereotypes are being broken down. No one trusts anyone else. They are afraid. They are afraid of dirty tricks. Therefore, what the Soviet Union and the United States are initiating by this process is a certain calming effect. A platform is being provided, which they can work upon.

I do not think that our visit to this region has been fruitless. We have not started this work for nothing. It is useful for our state. In this connection, I would like to emphasize that in all the trips, bilateral issues were simultaneously dealt with and discussed. With absolutely all the states, all issues were covered, including questions of trade and economic relations, financial matters, and the development of cultural relations, contacts, and exchanges. There was no country where we did not promote our relations. I think that this region deserves continued efforts and continued attention. We will work.

Views Peace Prospects

PM1705154091 Moscow IAN PRESS RELEASE in English 15 May 91

[Interview with USSR Foreign Minister Aleksandr Bessmertnykh by Vladimir Markov; date, place not specified: first paragraph is introduction: "Aleksandr Bessmertnykh on the Prospect for a Middle East Peace Conference"]

[Text] After the Cairo talks with US Secretary of State James Baker, USSR Minister of Foreign Affairs Aleksandr Bessmertnykh spoke to Novosti's Vladimir Markov:

The meeting with James Baker in Cairo was constructive. We discussed specifically a peace conference on the Middle East. It is necessary to agree upon its procedure—whether it will work at intervals of permanently, or enable the sides to come together, then to work in groups and after that to assemble again etc.

At the moment the questions relating to the procedure of the conference have not been resolved. There are differences among the prospective participants in the talks, but these are not differences between the cochairmen—the USSR and the USA. We want to find an option which would make it possible to draw the sides' stands closer together.

As for the participation of the United Nations in the conference (to all appearances, the participation of the Europeans in it has been agreed upon), there are also some questions to be discussed. So, the search for a basis acceptable to all the participants in the future conference continues.

Since both sides have gone deep into these themes, there are no surprises for us in the obtaining situation. We are now examining all its nuances. All the main work for analysing the situation has been done, and we are now discussing what it is necessary to undertake.

It is relevant to say here that, alongside the bilateral working group, a working group for the problems of security, economy, water supply, and ecology, ie the problems which are common to the region and cannot be resolved on a bilateral basis, will apparently function within the framework of the conference (of course, if it takes place).

To be sure, other countries should participate in the work of the second group. This does not mean, however, participation of other countries in the first working group of states. It is still necessary to agree in what form they will be able to take part in the working group on the general problems of the region.

On the whole, much has been resolved. When we were beginning to discuss the idea of the conference, hosts of problems divided the sides. Now their circle has narrowed to practically two to three questions. As it always happens in life, the last questions are the most difficult to resolve. We will work on them and again contact the prospective participants in the conference.

INTERFAX Commentary

OW2005053491 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1800 GMT 17 May 91

[From "Diplomatic Panorama"]

[Text] The Soviet Foreign Minister, Mr Aleksandr Bessmertnykh, has this week ended his first tour of the region by holding talks in Damascus, Amman, Jerusalem, Cairo, and Riyadh, with preparations for an international Middle East peace conference being the main issue on the agenda. He also had a meeting in Geneva with PLO leader, Mr Yassir 'Arafat. A DP [Diplomatic Panorama] correspondent, Andrei Sergeyev, says both the minister and accompanying Soviet diplomats expressed satisfaction about the outcome of the visit.

Mr Bessmertnykh's visit to Israel, the first of its kind by a Soviet foreign minister to that country in the history of bilateral relations was the most exciting part of his Middle East tour. Contrary to many forecasts, the Minister's visit to Jerusalem was not followed by an anouncement for restoring diplomatic relations which were broken in 1967. However, Mr Bessmertnykh promised that this might hapen in the near future. Tel Aviv may have to make concessions on the Palestinian issue and ease its stand on a Middle East conference for Moscow to agree to open diplomatic relations with Israel.

Indicatively, the holding of Soviet Israeli talks in Jerusalem caused a painful reaction in the Arab world Soviet officials say the venue is always named by a hosting government [sentence as received] . They said, "We couldn't insist for Tel Aviv to be the venue because the Israeli foreign ministry and the government are both in Jerusalem". At the same time, the Soviet diplomats insist that Mr Bessmertnykh's visit to Jerusalem does not indicate a change in Moscow's position; it continues to withhold recognition to Jerusalem as the Israeli capital.

On preparations for a regional peace conference, neither Mr Bessmertnykh's nor Mr Baker's tours of almost similar countries taken nearly at the same time helped resolve the main controversial issues which prevent the Arabs and Israelis from sitting together at the negotiating table.

Soviet diplomats single out two main difficulties. One is about UN representation in the conference. The Arab countries, mostly Syria, insist on a maximal UN role. Tel Aviv is opposed blaming the United Nations for it pro Arab stance. The second stumbling block is whether the conference will be a one off or continued affair. Unlike the Arabs, Tel aviv insists that after the first session the conference (or "an international meeting on the Middle East", by Israeli jargon) must be shifted to face to face talks between Israel and separate Arab countries. One other headache is Palestinian representation at the conference which, said Soviet diplomats, caused less dispute than expected. According to DP information, there are three options for Palestinian representation now under discussion. Palestinians may form a separate delegation or together with Jordan, or come as part of a joint Arab delegation. Soviet diplomats believe the second option is most likely, King Hussein of Jordan had agreed to form a join delegation with the Palestinians. Other parties in the conference raised no serious objection.

Mr Bessmertnykh's visit is a further indication of superpower rapproachment of recent months on the Middle East issue. His talks in Cairo with the American secretary of state, Mr James Baker, indicated that bilateral positions on a Middle East settlement have never been so close since the outbreak of the Arab Israeli conflict.

TASS Analyst Views Tour

LD1705082291 Moscow TASS in English 1921 GMT 16 May 91

[By TASS News Analyst Pavel Vasilyev]

[Text] Moscow May 16 TASS—Apparently, the visit to the Middle East by Soviet Foreign Minister Aleksandr Bessmertnykh is not a simple "demonstration of flag". At minimum, it signified several new accents in Soviet Middle Eastern policy, thus giving a new dimension to the situation in the region.

The Soviet Union restricted itself for a long time to a traditional circle of partners, which in many respects determined the country's policy in the region. Contacts with Israel, which began several years ago, signified a departure from this practice. The next step has been taken. It does not boil down only to the symbolic visit to Israel, the first ever by a Soviet foreign minister to this country.

Bessmertnykh's statements were evidence that Soviet attitude to Middle Eastern problems was enriched by a more profound understanding of the concerns and interests of the sides. This also refers to the interests and requirements of Israel's security. At the same time, a more balanced view on the situation does not mean a departure from the fundamental perception of the principles of peace settlement.

Among these principles, "territory for peace" is undoubtedly the key principle. It is interesting that the United States has been lately signifying its adherence to it as well. This creates a reliable common foundation which will influence the nature and future results of the peace process.

Naturally, the organisational aspect is also of great importance, in addition to the contents of this process. Judging by the Soviet minister's declarations, he agrees that talks between parties directly involved in the conflict must play the key role. The peace conference on the Middle East cannot replace them. It will enable its co-chairmen and the world community to play the role of catalyst, both at the first stage when it is important to get the process off the ground, and possibly at subsequent stages.

The Soviet minister's visit to the Middle East, its contacts with the representatives of the countries of the region, as well as with the U.S. secretary of state should not be regarded as a culmination of preparations for the Middle East peace conference. In order to reach this frontier, one should expect from other countries, primarily Israel, reciprocal statements of new unbiased thinking.

This view, expressed in the circles close to the Soviet minister, has an added urgency in light of the proven realism of the Soviet approach.

Hopes for Peace 'Gradually Increasing'

LD1605152191 Moscow Radio Moscow World Service in English 1310 GMT 16 May 91

[Text] The Soviet foreign minister, Aleksandr Bessmertnykh, has accomplished his tour of the Middle East. It coincided with the time with [as heard] the United States Secretary of State James Baker's visit to the region. Comments now by Aleksandr Pogodin:

One of the main results of the tour is a general recognition that the Soviet Union should take a more active part in the Middle East settlement. It was pointed out by the leaders of Saudi Arabia, Jordan, Egypt, Syria, Israel, and the Palestine Liberation Organization. Coordinated steps taken by the Soviet Union and the United States were the main point of discussion during the talks between Aleksandr Bessmertnykh and James Baker. Particular attention was given to the prospects of convening a peace conference in the Middle East. The Soviet Union is approaching the problem realistically, taking into account (?fierce) contradictions between the sides concerned. Moscow thinks it highly important to give the process a start. It may not be excluded that the initial format of the conference will change when other problems arise, but this way or other it is necessary to find solutions to the most acute problems, including the creation of the Palestinian state.

The Soviet Union doesn't intend to shrink from its part of responsibility, which is proved by its readiness to act as a co-chairman of the Middle East peace conference together with the United States. Making an assessment of the situation in the Middle East, the Soviet foreign minister expressed a strong conviction that there appeared a real chance to settle the situation in the region and it mustn't be missed.

The general results of the meetings in the Middle East countries show that the hope for peace is gradually increasing. At present almost all the countries of the region speak of the necessity to seek peace and favor the beginning of the peace conference. Of course, some skeptically-minded people might object that no practical agreement has been reached on important issues. The sitution, however, needs a realistic approach bearing in mind that it is next to impossible to resolve all the Middle East's chronic problems at one go. We mustn't underestimate the general conviction to continue the dialogue in search of a solution that would suit all the parties involved in the conflict.

Nishanov Delegation Ends Visit to Libya, Egypt

PM2005132991 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 20 May 91 Union Edition p 4

[Report by correspondent D. Velikiy: "Soviet Parliamentarians in Near East"]

[Text] Cairo—The USSR Supreme Soviet delegation headed by Rafik Nishanov, chairman of the Soviet of Nationalities, has concluded its stay in Libya and Egypt.

Sharing his impressions of the trip, R. Nishanov indicated that the Libyan population at the level of people's committees and districts and cities plays a direct role in formulating laws, and something could be learned from their activity.

As for Egypt, elements of the mechanism for executing laws could be borrowed from the parliamentary system here. The control system here is well established and, following its adoption, a law becomes a real law for society. The Consultative Council, which surveys draft laws as a preliminary, helps parliament and the president. No such system exists in the USSR, and R. Nishanov believes that in the future we could also think about more people participating in lawmaking activity when drawing up a new constitution and clarifying questions of the national state system.

The activity of various Egyptian parliamentary commissions is also of interest, especially since many of them are identical to those in our country: commissions on transport questions, legislation, the development of culture, and international affairs. Some accords have already been secured regarding broadening contacts. In particular, Egypt's highly influential Muslim center—Al-Azhar

University—will provide considerable assistance in cadre training and information exchange with Muslims in our country.

R. Nishanov had a lengthy conversation with Egyptian President Husni Mubarak, during which it emerged that the Egyptian leader is keeping a most attentive eye on everything that is happening in the USSr and hopes that the USSR will not split up since that would represent an extremely destabilizing factor in international politics. Egypt is prepared to assist the USSR—but on a mutually beneficial basis. The Egyptian president regards the documents signed during his visit to Moscow last year as a program basis for the subsequent broadening of relations between the two states.

The problem of a Near East settlement also reared its head several times during R. Nishanov's talks with Arab politicians and public figures. They believe that the Soviet Union has tremendous potential to exert a positive influence on the situation in the Near East and should play a significant role in a settlement in the region.

Comments on Egypt Visit

LD1805232891 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 1800 GMT 18 May 91

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Excerpts] The visit to the Arab Republic of Egypt by a USSR Supreme Soviet delegation led by Rafik Nishanov, chairman of the Soviet of Nationalities, has ended. The delegation was invited to the country by Egypt's National Assembly. [passage omitted]

[Begin recording] [Correspondent Gerasimov] What are your impressions of the delegation's visit to Libya and Egypt?

[Nishanov] Our Egyptian friends have an enormous desire to cooperate with the Soviet Union exclusively on a basis of mutual benefit. We discovered an enormous desire to develop economic links, commercial links, and cultural links. We found a very great striving for intellectual contacts. We naturally told our Arab friends in detail about the progress of perestroyka in the Soviet Union. They welcome the progress of perestroyka at all levels. They stressed the need to preserve a strong, powerful Soviet Union. [end recording] [video shows Mubarak receiving delegation, interview with Nishanov]

U.S. Seen Edging Away From Aid to Mujahidin

PM1905185591 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 15 May 91 Second Edition p 4

[Report by correspondent V. Gan: "Hard To Justify: United States on Aid to Afghanistan"]

[Text] Washington, 14 May—Here on the Potomac now talk is turning increasingly often to the need to review the U.S. approach to the conflict in Afghanistan. At the moment there is no direct evidence that Washington is moving toward a retraction of its policy aimed at overthrowing the Kabul regime. But the indirect evidence is increasing all the time.

Administration officials wishing to remain anonymous recently reported that the White House has not asked Congress to allocate resources for aid to the Afghan opposition in the fiscal 1992 budget request. Even though the process of elaborating the budget will take another few months, though the administration has reserved the right to request resources for this secret program, and though Congress itself can allocate money for it, the news was viewed by observers as another indication of a possible change of mood in the Washington establishment. It is reported that more and more people in the corridors of power here believe that the policy of supporting the insurgents is out of date and, most important of all, is proving ineffective.

Now, it is said, some administration strategists are even prepared to examine the question of a unilateral cessation of supplies, which at the moment is officially made dependent on Moscow's agreement to a similar step toward Kabul. There are several reasons. First and foremost, Washington is becoming increasingly disillusioned with the Afghan opposition leaders, whose political goals clearly conflict with the Americans'. For example, during the Persian Gulf war, three of the seven groupings supported Iraq in its confrontation with the international coalition. The administration is also increasingly tending to the view that the conflict in Afghanistan is a civil war and not a cold-war squabble between the two superpowers. For that reason it is becoming increasingly difficult to justify the U.S. interference in that country.

As the recent events in the Persian Gulf showed, Moscow and Washington can really cooperate on regional questions. Administration officials do not hide their hopes that constructive collaboration between the two great powers will also have an effect on one of the bloodiest conflicts.

It is still too soon to say. But no one here is ruling anything out. The history of recent years has sprung quite a few surprises. Perhaps this time too the political will of the Soviet and U.S. leaderships will be able to help end the bloodshed on Afghan soil.

West Europe

Gorbachev Meets Portuguese President Soares

LD2005171491 Moscow TASS in English 1647 GMT 20 May 91

[Text] Moscow May 20 TASS—It has been formally announced here that President Mikhail Gorbachev and President Mario Soares of Portugal met in the Kremlin today for a friendly "unscripted" conversation.

The two presidents touched upon major contemporary problems, including the crucial period of perestroyka reforms, major decisions of state, already made or being prepared, as well as the tendency towards conciliation in society and the union.

Mikhail Gorbachev told Soares about his assessment of the most complex problems and dangers in the Soviet people's transition towards new forms of political and economic life, the nature of power and ownership, the revolution of mentality and the emergence of new social awareness of new values.

Gorbachev and Soares reasserted their commitment to the socialist idea and stressed the viability of this idea, they spoke about the sources of this idea rooted in the people's age-old desire for justice, about the need to search for a modern understanding of socialism—taking into account the entire experience of attempts, often tragic, at building socialism.

The presidents exchanged views on the present, perhaps the most crucial moment in history, when the world community—and above all states with the greatest potential capable of influencing the course of events—must take their stand with regard to the Soviet Union not only by verbally expressing compassion or approval but by taking direct action.

The two presidents expressed satisfaction with the Angolan settlement reaching the home stretch, to which development both governments contributed considerably.

Peace in Angola, they pointed out, will open vast prospects for the rapid progress in that, the richest African country. The success of transformations in South Africa and the establishment of new relations among the countries of southern Africa, they noted, will be of great importance for the continent and for the entire international development.

The presidents agreed that political relations between the Soviet Union and Portugal are quite good, but their economic relations are virtually at a zero—on the strength of some circumstances, especially the present state of the Soviet economy. Measures are being taken to change the situation for the better also in this field.

Mario Soares reiterated the invitation for the Soviet president to pay an official visit to Portugal. Mikhail Gorbachev reiterated his wish to do so, and said that it could best be done next year.

Mikhail Gorbachev hosted a breakfast in honour of the visiting Portuguese president.

Kohl Seeking 'Short' Meeting With Gorbachev

LD1705181391 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1708 GMT 17 May 91

[By TASS correspondent Aleksandr Semenov]

[Text] Bonn, 17 May (TASS)—FRG Chancellor Kohl intends to meet with USSR President Mikhail Gorbachev if the possibility arises before the parliamentary summer break begins. Speaking to journalists in Bonn today, he underlined that concrete talks in connection with the time of the meeting have not yet been concluded.

It would certainly be a short meeting, the head of the German Government said. One cannot count on more because of the existing timetable of other meetings. According to Kohl, he sees no necessity for a longer meeting as intensive telephone conversations take place between him and M.S. Gorbachev on a regular basis.

Germany Withdrawal Agreement Enters Into Force

PM2005134191 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 18 May 91 Union Edition p 5

[Unattributed report: "Entry Into Force of Soviet-German Documents"]

[Text] USSR Foreign Minister A.A. Bessmertnykh and K. Blech, FRG ambassador to the USSR, have exchanged certificates of ratification of the treaty between the USSR and the FRG on the terms for the temporary stay and planned withdrawal of Soviet troops from FRG territory signed in Bonn 12 October 1990. Thus the treaty, which until then had only temporary application, has finally entered into force.

At the same time as a result of the exchange of the relevant notes, the agreement between the USSR and FRG governments on some transitional measures signed in Bonn 9 October 1990 enters into force.

Troop Pullout Campaign 'Launched' by FRG Press

LD2005154891 Moscow Radio Moscow World Service in English 1210 GMT 20 May 91

[Text] The problems connected with the withdrawal of the Soviet troops from Germany are very important not only for developing relations between the Soviet Union and the Federal Republic of Germany but also for the whole of Europe. Our correspondent in Berlin, Anatoliy (Stopkin), discusses the problems facing the Soviet Western Army Group:

The German press, especially right wing periodicals, have recently launched a campaign aimed at accelerating the withdrawal of the Soviet troops, but there are intergovernment agreements envisaging their planned pullout before the end of 1994. Recently, the fourth meeting of the Soviet-German working group dealing with the problem recently ended in Wunstorf, the headquarters of the Soviet Western Army Group. The sides discussed how to plan for 1991 is being carried out. They've also coordinated exact schedules to withdraw troops before 1994. The members of the working group have stated that the withdrawal is being carried out as planned. For the moment, about 44,000 people; 10,000 units of military technology; 260,000 tonnes of material supplies, including over 140,000 tonnes of ammunition, have already been withdrawn from the territory of Germany. The figures are impressive. As many as 106 military garrisons have been left completely; of them, 76 facilities have been accepted by the German side; the rest are being prepared to be handed over. Before the end of the year, there'll be no more Soviet troops in the town of Erfurt and Magdeburg. According to the Chief Commander of the Western Army Group General Matvey Burlakov, who says that all in this year the total of 30 per cent of the personnel, machinery, armaments, and material supplies of the Western Army Group should be withdrawn, the complete pullout will be ended by the end of 1994.

Economic Consequences of German Unification Viewed

LD2005120291 Moscow TASS in English 1148 GMT 20 May 91

[By TASS commentator Vladimir Sergeyev]

[Text] Moscow May 20 TASS—There is much talk about German financial difficulties during the integration of the five Eastern lands. Nothing is said, however, about the economic damage inflicted on the Soviet Union by the rupture of close economic ties with enterprises in the former German Democratic Republic.

The Soviet Union and Germany concluded a number of agreements to overcome difficulties during the transition period and bring Soviet-German relations to a new level.

Nevertheless, the economic consequences of German unification have proven more serious for the German and Soviet sides then could have been expected.

For instance, the Soviet Union annually supplied the GDR with 1.2 billion roubles (3.6 billion marks) worth of machinery and equipment. Current contracts for deliveries total only 169 million roubles.

The Soviet side cannot afford to purchase goods from the FRG, which negatively affected the economy of the five Eastern lands. The loss of orders from the USSR has forced East German enterprises to go bankrupt boosting unemployment and aggravating social conflicts.

The Soviet side must allocate large sums of money to maintain troops in Germany, because funds allocated by the German side do not cover all expenses.

Trying to ease the situation, the FRG granted the Soviet Union 12 billion marks in credit to purchase goods in the five Eastern lands, and a number of large contracts were concluded. These orders were placed with a number of enterprises in the East making it possible to protect workplaces. The agreements were also advantageous to the Soviet Union, although the credit was given at high interest. The Soviet Union must increase exports to the FRG, without relying only on energy sources. Favourable prospects are offered by the development of specific cooperation programmes with the Krupp, Mannesmann and Siemens firms.

Moscow reacted positively to Germany's readiness to participate in large projects in the fuel and raw material industries in the USSR. The FRG also suggested that East German enterprises should help implement unfinished projects in the USSR.

Preliminary talks within the framework of a working group of the intergovernmental commission on economic, scientific and technological cooperation between the USSR and the FRG, working in Moscow from May 13 to 14, have been promising.

German Minister of Economics Jurgen Moellemann will arrive in the USSR on May 21. He is expected to address outstanding matters in bilateral economic and commercial relations that resulted from German unification.

Forthcoming Visit by Italy's Andreotti Previewed

LD2005132191 Moscow TASS in English 1258 GMT 20 May 91

[By TASS diplomatic correspondent Leonid Timofeyev]

[Text] Moscow May 20 TASS—Chairman of the Italian Council of Ministers Giulio Andreotti is expected to arrive for a brief working visit in the USSR on Tuesday evening. TASS has learned that his agenda includes talks with President Mikhail Gorbachev and Prime Minister Valentin Pavlov, as well as Soviet-Italian negotiations in plenary sessions.

Soviet presidential aide Vitaliy Ignatenko said during a briefing in Moscow that the head of the Italian Government was "a very desirable and privileged negotiator in the Kremlin". Talks with Andreotti are expected to focus on the situation in the Middle East, the Mediterranean region and eastern Europe.

In light of the Soviet economic reform, attention is bound to be devoted also to economic cooperation. Moscow experts say that the Soviet leadership has taken a very serious approach to Andreotti's visit, very seriously, regarding it as a chance to discuss many important problems with Italy, a reliable partner. The favourable progress of bilateral relations is illustrated by the fact that last year Italy moved up to second place (after Germany) in economic cooperation with the Soviet Union.

Last November Gorbachev and Andreotti signed a treaty on friendship and cooperation between the Soviet Union and Italy. And although the Italian parliament has not completed its ratification yet, Moscow feels as though it is actually in force, furnishing a favourable background for the Italian premier's forthcoming visit.

Supreme Soviet

New Emigration Law To Be Implemented 1 Jan 93

LD2005124491 Moscow All-Union Radio First Program Radio-1 Network in Russian 1200 GMT 20 May 91

[Excerpts] At the USSR Supreme Soviet session. Here is Olga Vasilenko, our correspondent in the Kremlin.

[Vasilenko] [passage omitted] A resolution on the implementation of the emigration law has been adopted. It will be implemented beginning 1 January 1993, while some of its articles will be implemented earlier, as they are being finalized by the government. Surely our listeners will want to ask: Why is the implementation of the law being delayed so much—for more than one and a half years? There are many reasons. But one of the most obvious ones is that we will be only able to prepare 10,000 foreign passports within this period of time.

By the way, a passport will cost 1,000 rubles, so we can conclude that the law will not be quite as costly for the people as was suggested, with an enviable persistence by the group of deputies protecting the interests of working people. [passage omitted]

Sanctions Against Wildcat Strikes Stiffened

LD2005185691 Moscow TASS in English 1835 GMT 20 May 91

[By TASS parliamentary correspondent Ivan Ivanov]

[Text] Moscow May 20 TASS—The Soviet parliament today amended the law on the order of settling labour disputes (conflicts) adopted in autumn 1989. The amendments stiffen sanctions for wildcat strikes.

Parliament chairman Anatoliy Lukaynov said that amendments and supplements to the law "are actions by the country's legislature to pull the economy out of the crisis."

Chairman of the parliamentary commission on labour and social policy Nikolay Gritsenko stressed in his speech that amendments and supplements to the law were prompted by the need to adjust it with the law on trade unions, rights and guarantees of their activities, which was adopted several months ago.

Under this law, trade unions were granted the right to organise and hold strikes. This provision is now incorporated in the law on the order of settling labour disputes.

Gritsenko also noted that the law now includes addenda "concerning responsibility for holding wildcat strikes."

Under this act, strikes organised without the observance of this law and for political reasons are recognised as illegal: strikes "demanding a change in the constitutional system, the holding, dissolution or a change in the order of the operation of supreme bodies of state authority, resignation of their chief officers or the leaders of the state and republics, as well as resulting in the violation of national and racial equality or the change of borders."

The supreme courts of republics or higher judicial authorities in territories, regions or cities take a decision to recognise a strike as illegal.

If the court of law recognises a strike illegal, the participation in it is regarded as the violation of labour discipline and may entail appropriate measures.

Organisers of and participants in a wildcat strike are fined up to 3,000 rubles by the court and may be discharged.

People who force workers to strike by force or a threat of force are sentenced to a one-year imprisonment or to two years of correctional labour.

The law contains a provision that the Soviet president has the right to postpone a strike or to suspend it for two months. The same right is granted to chief executives or supreme bodies of state authority in republics.

The amendments to the law were voted in by 336 deputies to five, with nine abstaining.

Appointments Named During Supreme Soviet Session

PM1705140591 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 17 May 91 Second Edition p 2

[Report by Yu. Makhrin: "Premier Names His Team—At the USSR Supreme Soviet Session"]

[Text] For two days, the country's parliament members worked in the committees and commissions preparing the "groundwork"—draft laws to be examined in the plenary sessions. Yesterday, however, the session began by examining personnel questions as the prime minister continues to form his cabinet. A. Lukyanov stated that the president has requested agreement on the latest batch of appointments.

V. Pavlov gave a general introduction to the election of candidates:

"Comrade Deputies, you are well acquainted with the people who stand before you today, so my address will probably be very brief."

Valentin Sergeyevich's expectation was not vindicated. He had to remain on the platform for a long time. A heated discussion flared up on the anticrisis program and the crisis itself, its causes and its consequences. It was supposed that the premier and his "new recruits" would be asked concise questions and that they would issue similar answers. However, most deputies delivered speeches outlining their own view of one or other economic problems. Credit is due to V. Pavlov who patiently defended both the Cabinet's policy and his new team members' candidacies. However, it was noted that his patience is close to running out... And with cause.

Certain deputies were very highhanded in their treatment of those whom they are entitled to appoint. The tone of the discussion proved, to put it mildly, so unparliamentary that the hall was frequently filled with an indignant hum. One Supreme Soviet member even threatened to leave the hall if the people here feel at liberty to disregard fundamental ethical norms.

First the parliament confirmed V.I. Shcherbakov's appointment as first deputy prime minister and simultaneously minister of the economy and forecasting. It is not expedient to create two ministries working in parallel, V. Pavlov said.

Next, agreement was obtained on the appointment of N.P. Laverov, another deputy prime minister, as chairman of the State Committee for Science and Technology.

The first woman to appear in the Cabinet of Ministers is B.F. Rakhimova, a deputy prime minister. A USSR people's deputy, she was until recently a USSR Supreme Soviet member. She will be entrusted with a sector of the utmost importance—social questions.

Furthermore, S.R. Sitaryan's candidacy for the post of deputy prime minister for foreign economic links was put to the vote. Parliament withheld consent to his appointment. As soon as the ballot results "lit up" the tableau, an impassioned discussion arose in the hall again (note that there was no discussion before the ballot). Unfortunately, here too people felt obliged to resort to emotional outbursts. The argument resulted in a decision for the three committees to examine S. Sitaryan's candidacy afresh. Their conclusions will be announced at a forthcoming Supreme Soviet session.

At the deputies' insistence V. Shcherbakov made a brief statement about the decisions adopted by the Cabinet of Ministers and the republics the day before yesterday on the social defense of citizens in view of the price increases.

At the daytime session, the deputies continued examining the Law on State Security on its second reading.

It was adopted. In this connection V. Kryuchkov, chairman of the USSR KGB, took the platform.

"The initiators of this law—officials in the state security organs—expected it to be adopted long ago, because we want to live by the law, the truth. The issue today is this: Either the authority of the law will prevail in our country, or tyranny and humiliation of the individual will reign for a long time."

The Law on the USSR Control Chamber was adopted at the evening session. A.K. Orlov, a member of the country's Supreme Soviet, was appointed its chairman.

With "curtain down" approaching, the chairman presented for discussion a draft law on exit from and entry to the USSR. The old man of the draft laws, as one deputy rightly commented. It was examined on first reading as far back as 1989. Recently, 13 May, it was once again subjected to "x-ray" treatment: Alas, in the Soviet of Nationalities it fell 12 votes short of being adopted wholesale. At that time, a conciliation commission was also set up. It drew up three versions of the proposals, and these were announced by I. Laptev.

And again a vehement debate flared up. Two opposing views prevailed. First: The measure of our society's socialist awareness is defined by the measure of each individual's freedom to move around. Second: Why do we talk about defending the rights of those who, having been educated at the nation's expense, then leave, yet remain silent over the rights of those who stay?

Not one of the three proposals was endorsed during the ballot. The long-suffering draft law was returned to the conciliation commission to be examined at the next Supreme Soviet session on 20 May.

Supreme Soviet 20 May Session Reviewed

LD2005224991

[Editorial Report] Moscow Central Television Second Program Network in Russian at 1845 GMT on 20 May carries a 50-minute edition of the "USSR Supreme Soviet session" program, including recorded highlights from the USSR Supreme Soviet session in the Kremlin on 20 May. Reception is good.

An unidentified announcer opens the program by noting that the Emigration Bill was approved at the session and that it will go into effect on 1 January 1993. An unidentified deputy then rises to say that he thinks the bill is fine as it is and that it should not take so long to implement. He also warns that there could be speculation during the delay which could affect economic aid from abroad.

Deputy Pavlov then takes the floor to discuss specific legal aspects of the bill from the republican citizenship point of view. An unidentified deputy raises the question of republics introducing emigration bills before the union emigration bill. Another unidentified deputy then discusses indexation of wages as being more urgent than the emigration bill, adding that it is the government's responsibility to determine how to implement the bill.

At 1859 GMT, USSR Supreme Soviet Chairman Anatoliy Lukyanov briefly explains why more time is needed to implement the bill.

Deputy Burlatskiy then takes the floor to explain why deputies should agree to enforcing the bill itself in 1993 and to enforcing a series of the bill's articles up until then, before he tables a resolution on stage-by-stage enforcement of the bill's articles. Two unidentified deputies express their support for enforcing the bill's articles up until 1993.

Deputy Panfilova then rises to say deputies should not go abroad until the bill has been passed so as to leave everyone in the same boat on the question. Several unidentified deputies interject, some supporting and some rejecting the bill and its articles. An unidentified speaker then explains the bill's details before calling a vote.

At 1910 GMT, deputies pass the bill, with 288 for, 31 against, and 31 abstentions.

The vote is followed by debate on the Labor Disputes Bill.

Deputy Gritsenko reports on the bill, explaining amendments to the bill made by various committees and commissions and detailing articles of the bill on settling labor disputes and the systems for settling these disputes. He also explains when strikes are justified, saying there must be a majority for a strike. Gritsenko points out that differences of opinion on political strikes exist and that they are forbidden in the FRG and the UK. He cites an ILO official as saying strikes should be economic and not political. Gritsenko notes that it was decided to leave the wording of the bill as is, reminding that there is legislation against forcible attempts to change the political system. He adds that commissions and committees should draft resolutions instructing committees to draft a bill on implementing political demands of citizens and should table it for examination by the USSR Supreme Soviet's sixth session. Gritsenko explains other provisions of the bill before proposing adoption of the amended bill.

An unidentified announcer then reports that Gritsenko's report was followed by "heated" debate of the bill. He notes that deputies eventually decided to adopt the provision on the illegality of strikes if political demands are substituted for economic ones and to instruct the committees and commissions to draft a document regulating the rights regarding making political demands. The announcer reports that the session ratified the changes in the laws and adopted the relevant resolution.

Deputy Klochkov is then shown reading out the text of an appeal to the Supreme Soviet, on behalf of the Leningrad war veterans, which criticizes the idea of changing the city's name from Leningrad to St. Petersburg. Klochkov says the idea is a plot to turn Leningrad from the cradle of the Revolution to the cradle of counterrevolution, that the name can only be changed at an all-union referendum, and that deputies should remember the city's revolutionary traditions and associations with Lenin.

At 1934 GMT, Lukyanov proposes that commissions and committees be instructed to draft a decision on this question. After some shouting, the proposal is agreed upon.

At 1935 GMT, the program ends with the announcer reminding that the session will continue its work on 21 May.

Political & Social

Air Traffic Controller Strike Postponed to 10 Aug

LD2005213191 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 2050 GMT 20 May 91

[Text] There will not be a strike of air traffic controllers tomorrow. We have been just informed that although the trade union of air traffic controllers and the Ministry of Civil Aviation failed to achieve a final agreement in the talks between the strike committee and representatives of the ministry and the USSR Cabinet of Ministers, as a temporary measure the salary of air traffic controllers and flight personnel will be increased by 50 percent, but not three-fold, as demanded. The strike committee, on its part, has thus postponed the strike, provisionally, until 10 August.

Gorbachev Moscow Science Conference Address Cited

LD2005115291 Moscow TASS in English 1129 GMT 20 May 91

[Text] Moscow May 20 TASS—"It is very important for science, which has already made an indispensable contribution to ending the 'cold war', to tackle problems during this new stage of world development. Very promising in this respect is the Asian-Pacific region, including its northeastern part, the development of which you will discuss," says President Gorbachev's address to the Moscow scientific conference on problems of the northeastern part of the Asian-Pacific region, which was circulated here today.

Gorbachev hails the ideas reflected in the conference's agenda. "I believe," he says, "that the results of your work and the ideas you will discuss are bound to be useful to everybody who wants to establish a new, peaceful order on our planet".

Gorbachev believes Soviet-American interaction, the recent summit meetings between the USSR and Japan, the USSR and the Republic of Korea and the USSR and China have initiated a process that will benefit hundreds of millions of people, inhabiting this part of the world.

He notes that "new political thinking will help peoples to see each other in their true light, will create an atmosphere of mutual understanding, trust and cooperation. I expect you to support its principles."

The message stresses that the conference's efforts "will take their place in the overall historical progress towards the 21st century civilisation".

Birthday of Late Academician Sakharov Commemorated

Moscow Street To Be Renamed

LD2005094791 Moscow Radio Moscow World Service in English 0800 GMT 20 May 91

[Excerpt] There will be a meeting today in Moscow to commemorate the late Dr. Andrey Sakharov, an outstanding physicist and human rights champion. The

Nobel Prize winner would have been 70 tomorrow. An international congress to commemorate Dr. Sakharov opens tomorrow in the Soviet capital. Among those invited are state and public figures from many countries.

One of the streets in the center of Moscow will bear the name of Dr. Andrey Sakharov. [passage omitted]

Rally Becomes Political Protest

LD2005211491 Moscow Russian Television Network in Russian 1700 GMT 20 May 91

[Text] [Announcer Yuriy Tostov] Hello! This is the "Vesti" program. A grandiose demonstration is taking place right now in Moscow devoted to the 70th birthday anniversary of Academician Sakharov. According to preliminary estimates, at least 200,000 people are taking part in it, and of course this procession is dedicated to our most topical problems today. [video shows portrait of Sakharov; people gathering for meeting, militiaman strolling past; black flag and several white, blue and red flags]

[Unidentified correspondent] There was nothing to indicate the forthcoming meeting literally one hour before it began, except perhaps the reinforced militia details and the sparse groups of Democratic Russia, the Union of Anarchists, and several other organizations and movements near the Pushkin monument. And that, incidentally, is the same place from which organizers of the forthcoming meeting, Democratic Russia, planned the movement of columns in Manezh Square. In just a few minutes everything changed. Streams of demonstrators began to flow along Tverskaya to Sovetskaya Ploshchad, and judging from the banners and placards, the meeting promised to turn not only into a day honoring the memory of Sakharov, but also to protest party policy and the actions of the authorities in the NKAO [Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast] and in support of Boris Yeltsin and Gavriil Popov.

The movement of columns halted by the Moscow city soviet building where, in a spontaneous meeting, Gavril Popov stated that the meeting of people's deputies of the Moscow city soviet refused to put forward his candidature for the post of Mayor of Moscow. Moreover, in spite of the will of the citizens, and their wishes have been expressed in 200,000...[report ends abruptly at this point] [video shows views of people marching along; close-ups of placards reading "Stop deportation of Armenians from Karabakh" and "We have been banished from Getashen"; large meeting near city council building; Popov speaking from a balcony draped with the Russian flag]

Shevardnadze Suggests UN Role To Ease USSR Strife

PM2005141391 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 20 May 91 First Edition p 5

[Unattributed report under the "Ours About Us" rubric and the general heading: "Opinion for Export"]

[Text] "If I had remained a member of the Soviet Government, I would not object to UN involvement in resolving internal conflicts," E.A. Shevardnadze declared in an interview for the SAN FRANCISCO CHRONICLE.

"We could allow UN troops to participate in settling conflicts. What is bad about that? We are trying to halt the killing." He advocated the involvement of a UN peacekeeping force in easing tension in the situation in the USSR connected with the exacerbated interethnic problems by deterring the warring sides from conflicts, and he added that the possibility of UN intervention in internal conflicts will, to all appearances, require a new definition of "national sovereignty."

As Shevardnadze said in a speech in San Francisco, he is perfectly well aware that UN interference in the USSR's internal affairs is something completely out of the ordinary and that his proposal might elicit a sharp reaction in the USSR, VOA reported. However, Shevardnadze pointed out, the difficulties which have been created demand new methods to resolve them. The former USSR foreign minister added that the presence of Americans on Soviet territory and the upcoming visit to this country by representatives of 22 European countries to observe the fulfillment of the arms limitation treaty are precedents for foreign interference in the USSR's internal interests.

In Shevardnadze's opinion, the United Nations must be granted the opportunity to make its contribution to resolving the internal problems which might in the future jeopardize the security of the entire region.

Shevardnadze Calls for 'Resolute Action'

OW2105012491 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1230 GMT 20 May 91

[Text] The Soviet Foreign Political Association's President Eduard Shevardnadze, now in the U.S. reading lectures on the USSR's foreign and home policies, has told IF [INTERFAX] that the situation in the Soviet Union "remains complex and controversial." He said unless "resolute action" was taken, the country might find itself messed up irrevocably.

E. Shevardnadze described the recent "Statement of Ten" as the first coordinated step toward curbing the destructive processes, but one taken "at least 1-2 years later than necessary."

Soviet ex-foreign minister said unless a platform for the coordinated efforts of the pro-democracy groups were created and the destructive processes [is] halted, "the threat of dictatorship and a return to totalitarianism would be very real."

E. Shevardnadze suggested that the new Treaty of Union would be signed by the 9 republics which endorsed the

"Statement of Ten," and said he did not believe that force might be used against the secession-oriented republics.

The full text of Eduard Shevardnadze's interview for IF's U.S. coorespondent Petr Vasilyev will be included in next Friday's edition of IF's weekly bulletin NATION & SOCIETY.

CPSU's Luchinskiy Meets Moscow Students' Aktiv

PM1705141991 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 17 May 91 Second Edition p 2

[TASS report: "Meeting at Raykom"]

[Text] P.K. Luchinskiy, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, met at the capital's Leninskiy Party Raykom [rayon party committee] with students and graduates of VUZ's [higher educational establishments]—activists from the Moscow City Students' CPSU Party Club. They had a frank discussion of students' pressing problems and their role in the country's sociopolitical life, the party's renewal, and the enhancement of Communist students' interest in implementing the CPSU's youth policy.

Luchinskiy, Others Address Party Editors' Course

PM2105141391 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 20 May 91 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Academy Studies Completed"]

[Text] Leaders of republic, kray, and oblast party newspapers and publishing houses have completed their studies at the CPSU Central Committee Academy of Social Sciences Institute for Raising the Qualifications of Leading Party, Soviet, and Ideological Cadres. Urgent questions of the activity of the communist press in conditions of the emergent political pluralism and the switch to a market economy were discussed there.

The students were addressed by P.K. Luchinskiy, G.V. Semenova, and O.S. Shenin, members of the Politburo and secretaries of the CPSU Central Committee; I.K. Polozkov, first secretary of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Communist Party Central Committee; V.I. Shcherbakov, first deputy prime minister of the USSR; M.F. Nenashev, chairman of the USSR State Committee for the Press; L.P. Kravchenko, chairman of the All-Union State Television and Radio Broadcasting Company; A.Ya. Degtyarev, V.A. Mikhaylov, and I.I. Skiba, heads of CPSU Central Committee departments; leaders of a number of central party publications, senior officials of the CPSU Central Committee and the RSFSR Communist Party Central Committee, and social scientists.

Gorbachev Aide Yakovlev on Right-Wing Threat

PM2005144891 Rome LA REPUBBLICA in Italian 12-13 May 91 p 17

[Interview with Security Council member Aleksandr Yakovlev by Enrico Franceschini in Moscow; date not given]

[Excerpt] Moscow—[introductory passage omitted] [Franceschini] Aleksandr Nikolayevich, after the "shift to the right" which has been discussed in recent months, are we on the threshold of a new change of course toward stability?

[Yakovlev] I think that we can glimpse some elements of stability and of an improvement in the situation. Of course, the widespread weariness among the people is not a comforting sign and from an emotional viewpoint, it is a pity that the euphoria about perestroyka is over: But even this is useful because rationalism and realism have replaced euphoria. Revolutions always lack a sense of reality. If it is present it immediately becomes the focus of suspicion, almost as if it were a sign of conservatism. However, it is common sense which is now protecting us from right-wing and left-wing extremism. The "Nine plus One agreement" among the leaders of the nine republics (including Russian President Yeltsin—LA REPUBBLICA editor's note) and Gorbachev has brought a degree of calm. And the right's defeat at the last CPSU Central Committee plenum will prompt more people to think seriously about what is happening. Of course, the struggle continues. A great deal depends on the possibility of achieving some economic improvement. In general nobody now feels like making forecasts: The Nine plus One agreement had scarcely been reached when the war between Armenians and Azerbaijanis began again, and I have a strange feeling that it is an organized provocation, not just a coincidence.

[Franceschini] Do you really think that there is a predetermined plan behind it? Is the recent article criticizing you which was published by SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA, the daily of the CPSU's most conservative wing, another similar sign?

[Yakovlev] The conflict between Armenians and Azerbaijanis has been going on since the sixth century, but this new explosion has all the signs of being organized. With regard to the article, it is an attempt by the right to take revenge for the defeat it suffered. Although, looking closely at it, I do not see it as an attack on me. When it says that the "ship" is without a captain, it is clear that the criticism is directed at the president. But I have been used to attempts to sow discord between us for some time now.

[Franceschini] Do you not think that by attacking you so openly at a time like this, the right has played into your hands?

[Yakovlev] I thought that too. And, in general, when some prominent people say they do not believe me, I am happy: If they said they believed me, I would be demoralized. Moreover, they also show profound ignorance when they attribute to me the saying that anything is legitimate other than what is prohibited by law: I did not invent that rule, it dates back to Roman law.

Or else they wonder why there is no portrait of Lenin in my office and make sarcastic remarks about the gaps on the wall. But it is not in my nature to take down or put up pictures, who knows, perhaps this room contained portraits of Stalin, Molotov, Brezhnev. Some people say that this was once Voroshilov's office, I do not know, that does not interest me....

[Franceschini] Have the common sense and the realism which you welcome not come rather late?

[Yakovlev] Look, we have lived too long in the world of myth. Greek and Roman mythology found expression in fables for children, in some moral precepts, in norms of behavior for men; and I love that mythology because in essence it teaches goodness, the search for inner happiness. But what about our mythology? Despite the fact that it was created with violence, there are many people who sincerely believe in those myths. How can such illusions be refined with a dose of common sense? It is very difficult. Many people believe us because everybody needs to believe in something—in the family, in God, in ideologies....

[Franceschini] And what do you believe in now, Aleksandr Nikolayevich?

[Yakovlev] In one thing only: the need to allow people to live viable, decent lives. As for all other credos, I believe that it would be immoral to be under any illusions, after all these decades of violence and wretchedness.

[Franceschini] Do you also believe that the dialogue between Gorbachev and Yeltsin is possible at last?

[Yakovlev] The dialogue between them is necessary; it is an imperative. Whether or not it goes ahead will be a measure of the sense of responsibility on both their parts.

[Franceschini] Why have so many supporters of perestroyka, starting with Shevardnadze, left Gorbachev?

[Yakovlev] Each went for his own reasons. Shevardnadze allowed himself to be overtaken by his feelings, though I do understand his reasons: There were pressures on me, too, from the military-industrial complex. But basically it is a good thing that people are resigning now because of political disagreements: It is a salutary lesson to young people, to the politicians of the next generation.

[Franceschini] Many people still wonder why Gorbachev has shifted from a swing to the right to this common-sense shift to a dialogue with the left.

[Yakovlev] Zigzags are an unavoidable law of political life, and sometimes nobody knows the reasons. It sometimes happens that an important event produces no effect, but then something trivial is enough to spark a crisis. But now at last we have the hope of hoping, and that is something.

[Franceschini] What is more dangerous to perestroyka—right-wing or left-wing extremism?

[Yakovlev] Definitely right-wing. This is obvious, because perestroyka is a left-wing movement, and a threat to it from the far left is actually a semi-threat. Moreover, the left has nothing to lose, except the word. The miners strike, but they have no weapons. The right, however, has enormous forces at its disposal. Also, consider the vast state apparatus, the thousands and thousands of officials that risk losing their jobs. The economist, Shatalin, has resigned, but he is an academic and will not end up as a hobo or homeless. For a member of the apparatus it is very different; his future is much more uncertain.

[Franceschini] If you think back now over these six years of perestroyka, what errors do you see, and what would you do differently?

[Yakovlev] One initial error was to have said that perestroyka gave everyone an opportunity—a promise based on idealism. Another mistake was the search for people to blame—the most shameful and primitive episode, to which the press contributed considerably by slinging mud at everyone. Another mistake was the inability to involve young people more. Six years have gone by, and look at our students: They are not on one side or the other, and that is not a good sign. We did not push our economic decisions hard enough: I remain convinced that we should have started with agricultural reform, but in 1985 to have talked about land ownership would have been like handing in your party membership card. The biggest mistake was to have taken the financial issue lightly. We acted in the old way—No cash? So let's print some. This created a huge mass of money. To reduce it we have now reached the painful moment of raising prices, though clearly to raise them in this way is pointless: The system must be changed.

[Franceschini] What are the priorities for the future?

[Yakovlev] The laws passed are good, but we still come up against the problem of the mechanisms whereby to implement these laws. Second, the self-management issue: As long as we proceed in a centralized manner, we will be able to do very little.

[Franceschini] But ultimately, are you now optimistic or pessimistic?

[Yakovlev] To call ourselves optimistic or pessimistic is not enough, too vague. We have to ask ourselves: Can we return to the USSR of pre-1985? No, this is no longer possible. So in this sense perestroyka has already been achieved. Are zigzags possible on the way? Yes. Why?

Because of greater difficulties than we expected, such as the issue of nationalism in our republics. Furthermore, Stalinism is still firmly embedded in people's minds; it is not dead, and Stalin's picture appeared at the May Day parade again this year.

[Franceschini] Aleksandr Nikolayevich, can we still describe you as "Gorbachev's right-hand man?" What is the status of your relations now, after the apparent coolness of the past several months?

[Yakovlev] The fact is that they have not changed. We have never stopped talking. We have already spoken to each other three times today. Is that not enough? Is it too much? You decide. But I am with him.

Nazarbayev Interviewed in Moscow on New Book

Expresses Support for Gorbachev

LD1905092891 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak Network in Russian 0030 GMT 19 May 91

[Excerpts] The presentation of a book by Nursultan Nazarbayev, president of Kazakhstan, took place in Moscow on 18 May. It is titled "Neither Right, Nor Left." Our correspondent Yelena Kadusheva attended the presentation. Here is the recording of her report.

[Begin recording] [Kadusheva] I am representing the Mayak radio station. Nursultan Abishevich, you titled your book "Neither Left, Nor Right." What is the message behind such a title? Does it mean that you are emphasizing your centrist position by it, and to what extent is this possible in our country and in your position?

[Nazarbayev] We all have witnessed various political trends over the perestroyka years, the emergence of new public movements and new parties. I have always acted in accordance with my principle. I think that I have never swung too much either to the left or to the right. I have always stood firmly on the positions of perestroyka which were adopted at the plenum which took place in April 1985. I have consistently supported President Gorbachev. As for issues of reforms, issues of the dismantling of an administrative-command system, a transfer of our society, our economy to new conditions for the benefit of the individual, I think that here you will agree with me if I say that my speeches and my deeds have been consistent, if you look back at them. As for the preservation of a powerful Soviet Union as a single state, I have always adhered to the following position: that Soviet people of many nationalities must live in friendship and that nobody's rights can be encroached upon, irrespective of nationality, creed, or party membership. And on this issue I stick to the centrist position, so to speak. As for fundamental reforms, I am entirely for a transfer to a market system. [passage omitted]

[Kadusheva] Many people look at you as a possible candidate for the USSR presidency, provided that a free election will take place. Do you think you are ready to enter a competition for this post?

[Nazarbayev] Firstly, we already have a president, and recently, as far as I know, he has been in favor of fundamental changes. He is flexible, and during the discussion that took place between Gorbachev and nine republics, we presented certain claims to Comrade Gorbachev, and we had his word, so to speak with regard to them. He, too, has certain obligations, including the recognition of the sovereignty of the republics. The Union will consist of sovereign states, and sovereign rights will be granted to these republics. Our task in this case is to provide support to Gorbachev at this stage in the life of our society. As for my personal plans, they do not include such a task. [passage omitted] [end recording]

Called 'Brightest' Political Figure

LD1905093791 Moscow Radio Moscow World Service in English 0800 GMT 19 May 91

[Text] There has been a public presentation ceremony in Moscow of a book by the President of Soviet Kazakhstan, Nursultan Nazarbayev.

Observers note that he has become one of the brightest figures on the political scene. With Nazarbayev many people link their hopes for a favorable outcome of the current reforms in the country.

In his book, written in the form of an autobiography, Nursultan Nazarbayev answers the most pressing questions about the future of the Union and about the future of perestroyka. At present, he says, the instinct of self-preservation alone should suggest that any moves increasing the economic and social chaos will tomorrow lead to a storm that will sweep us all away. Only a policy of common sense can prevent it, says the president of Kazakhstan.

Statesmen's 'Defense-Consciousness' Questioned

PM2005143091 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 17 May 91 Union Edition p 3

[Pavel Gutiontov article: "Outburst of 'Defense Consciousness': What the Statesmen Talked About Over a Cup of Tea"]

[Text] An everyday story: Three people call on a fourth, so as to have a chat about topics that interest them "beneath the crystal chandeliers in his splendid office," as someone once put it. The meeting takes place, and the collocutors are so pleased with it that they publish a transcript of their conversation in a newspaper, of which, incidentally, one of the collocutors is the editor. And so a friendly conversation among people who have known each other for years suddenly becomes an event in our public life. An event that is all the more significant when you know the names—of guests and host.

And so, the guests: O. Baklanov, deputy chairman of the Defense Council attached to the USSR president (until recently a CPSU Central Committee secretary); Admiral V. Chernavin, commander in chief of the Navy; and writer A. Prokhanov, the bard of "defense consciousness."

The host: General I. Rodionov, chief of the General Staff Academy.

And what are they discussing?

They are trying to explain to themselves and to their readers "who wanted, and for what reasons, to ruin our Army and deprive it not only of terrible weapons and strategic bridgeheads, but also of the people's love and trust." True, this is already clear to them even without discussions of any kind—the collocutors are entirely united on this point: The attacks on the Armed Forces have brought together the "foreign devil," as we call it, and the internal "fifth column"—it is ridiculous even to dispute it: "There is a war on, and our Army is being destroyed like in a war." In fact, if you translate from the language of emotion into the language of political terminology, what we are looking at is a frank demand for a radical revision of the foreign and domestic policy of recent years. It is a question of the reluctance of a section of our body of generals to recognize and reckon with present-day realities. Gen. Rodionov's guests are trying to assure us that in recent years we have begun to live in a far less secure world than in the days when we used to sit there, bristling with missiles that have now been destroyed, within the sights of American missiles (now destroyed); when our young men (who were defending these same "strategic borders") used to come back from Afghanistan in coffins, one after another; when our generals used to head a bloc of allies who, at the first opportunity, rejected us and dissociated themselves from us with such unanimous delight that it is terrifying even to think about what would have happened if our military thinkers had ever wanted to call on their support in a critical situation...

The general, the admiral, and the two civilians try to convince us of the urgent need to militarize public awareness, and declare that it is the Army and Navy that "preserve the patriotic state philosophy" and that "in the context of the current decline in state ethics, the collapse of public morality, and the destruction of collectivist and patriotic ideals, it is the Army that remains the custodian of these values." But it was [historian] V. Klyuchevskiy who once drew attention to those people who avow their love for the soldier, when what they really love is the barracks.

But let us return to the item published in the writers' newspaper DEN. At times, if I may say so, it looks as if the collocutors in Gen. Rodionov's luxurious office had been drinking something other than tea, such is the desperation with which these officials, employed in the service of the state, revise the decisions taken by the highest organs of state power. It's okay for Prokhanov (who proposed that a parade of the "Qandahar, Herat, and Kabul regiments" be held in Red Square, with the president who extricated them from the senseless and criminal threshing machine "standing at attention")—what right have we to make demands on Prokhanov? But when Oleg Dmitriyevich Baklanov declares meaningfully: "In order to assess scientifically the USSR's recent history and the conflicts and wars in which we have been involved, including the Afghan war, it is necessary to formulate the USSR's national state interests and clarify the question of whether the state was really acting in its own interests, or whether it was neglecting them"—then the question arises, has the deputy chairman of the Defense Council heard of the "Afghan" resolution adopted by the Congress of USSR People's Deputies, or does he suppose he has sufficient powers to overrule and "reformulate" it?

In just the same way, when the colonel general calls conversion "crazy—I would say criminal," you will agree that this makes a very clear impression (it would be fine if he was talking about the way in which conversion is being implemented). It is just the same when Baklanov, who for such a long time was responsible for the defense industry on the party Central Committee, speaks out on the subject of our miserly spending on weapons ("about 7 percent"). But, if I may say so, if the 93 percent of our resources left over from buying tanks is not enough to provide milk for babies and socks for veterans who went halfway across Europe with their 7.6-caliber rifles, then I think we should after all be asking ourselves what and whom the extra tanks will be defending. And against whom—that too...

The collocutors talk ironically about "democrats who are incapable of feeding the country." I am afraid this sounds like pure cynicism, coming from people who know very well that for decades this country gave up everything possible, and impossible, for defense needs.

How many people would the "democrats" be able to feed with even part of the funds invested in just one of the aircraft carriers they have launched?

But even that is not the most striking thing. I cannot resist citing in more detail at least one fragment of the conversation at the General Staff Academy.

"Maybe it really is necessary," Prokhanov asks, "in order to prevent civil war and the disintegration of the state, to say to hell with all these devious laws, and establish a dictatorship?" "What if you look at it from the other side"? Baklanov suggests (evidently entirely in agreement with the formulation of the question in the first place). And he continues his argument: "Empty stores—isn't that the dictatorship of hunger? Exorbitant prices—isn't that the dictatorship of poverty?.." And so forth, with the aim of demonstrating that today the "ordinary (?) man is already living under the oppression of several dictatorships," so there would be nothing so very terrible about another one, go ahead, say to hell with these "devious laws"... Prokhanov (after lamenting that the Army has not yet shown the necessary "political will," as he sees it, in which it "differs remarkably from everyone else"): "This does not mean, of course, that the defense complex does not have its own domestic political role. And that role will increase particularly after our postperestroyka time of troubles." "You're right," Baklanov seconds him, "if the Army has to take on the management of the economy, transport, society in general..." But he adds reassuringly: "The Army will be committed to handing over management to civilians as soon as possible and promoting the restoration of civil structures..."

And thus, as Bulgakov said, the conversation was woven. For the benefit of those who have not absorbed it fully (after all, the transcript took up two pages of the newspaper), basically the same idea has been expressed in more comprehensible, poetic language. [Writer] Stanislav Kunyayev, also a well-known advocate of "defense thinking," reports a conversation between monuments to our fallen soldiers, subjected to desecration in the capitals of the countries they once liberated: "The parliamentarians and businessmen ran all over us like lice at the front, they betrayed us on the embankments of the Seine, where all our borders were sold..." At the same time Kunyayev explained who demolished Poklonnaya Hill in Moscow: "The very same Lilliputians, worshipers of speculation and foreign currency... The same people who betrayed us in Malta, who sold off everything we built in Yalta, by the soldier's bayonet and the mighty hand of Stalin..." Do I need to remind you what kind of talks were held in Malta and Paris, by whom, with whom, and what about?

Let us call things by their names. We have before us, in the writers' newspaper, an exposition of a program that is systematically antipresident, anticonstitution, and ultimately antistate. In effect it rejects a whole series of decisions by the highest state organs of power, decisions that the military are not supposed to discuss, but to fulfill. But Gen. Rodionov's guests and their cronies, within the walls of the general's office, apparently do not like that role, and they inform "the city and the world" of this perfectly openly. They must be given a perfectly clear answer: Society does not exist for the Army, the Army exists for society.

Of course, I am far from supposing that the collocutors were sharing, through the newspaper DEN, their authentic plans for an authentic military coup. That is not how you accomplish a coup—that is how you frighten a torn society, cause hysteria, and set society against the Army. It is ridiculous to ask Kunyayev and Prokhanov why they want to do this, but the officials invested with real power who took part in the conversation should be answerable for their words. Especially bearing in mind one more factor that I think is important.

Many of you may remember the stir created by the "letter of the 53," which was addressed to the president last December, during the Fourth Congress of People's Deputies, by a number of important military, party, and public figures and scientists and production workers closely associated with the military-industrial complex. The essence of the ultimatum (and it was an ultimatum: not for nothing did the authors of the letter put such emphasis on the word "demand") was the abandonment of economic reforms, the implementation of a tough policy with regard to the republics, the imposition of order by means of the introduction of direct presidential rule... The president—in the name of preserving "a social system that was hard won at the cost of enormous sacrifices and was maintained through the incredible cataclysms of the last 70 years"—was invited to put his reliance on "the Army, which is tormented by persecution, uncertainty, worries"...

And today, now that it has become clear that society has resolutely rejected the proposed revision of perestroyka's "April" course, when a path to consensus is being hewn with such difficulty and trust is being restored, today we hear the same voices and the same words.

The signatories of the "letter of the 53" included Chernavin, Baklanov, Rodionov, Prokhanov, and Kunyayev.

In this connection let me remind you that the newspaper DEN often holds up as an example countries where "slandering" the Army and its leading cadres is not allowed and where their role and significance are constantly boosted and anxiously preserved. In particular, it mentions the United States, whose experience in this sphere (by way of an exception) is deemed positive.

Well, in the United States—and we all remember this from very recent events—they quickly dismiss the most promising generals if they allow themselves, even inadvertently, to make political statements that diverge from the administration's official course. Maybe our president and our parliamentarians will also give their assessment of the remarks cited here, remarks made by people to whom the country has entrusted its defense?

And another point that seems important to me. Some people try to assure us that we are seeing deliberate "persecution of the Army," a campaign to discredit the corps of officers and generals, and so forth. To be blunt, that is devious self-interest. In society, in all its spheres, a major reassessment of the old values is in progress; society is reforming, and the Armed Forces, as part of our social structures, must inevitably change along with it. Their role and place in our life will change, and they themselves will change. Attempts to portray the Army as an island of unchanging well-being, and thereby to oppose changes, are dishonest.

I doubt whether everyone reads DEN regularly. And so let me tell you: I am talking about issue No. 9 for this year, which came out on 9 May, of all days. Which enabled it to bring together in a banner headline on the front page its own title [DEN, meaning "DAY"] and the word "Victory."

Victory for what, and over what?

Alksnis Rebuts Soyuz 'Coup' Item, Author Responds

PM1705151191 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 15 May 91 Union Edition p 2

[V. Alksnis response under "Feedback" rubric to recent IZVESTIYA article by A. Kiva, plus commentary by the latter; first paragraph is editorial introduction: "Answering Back for the Union"]

[Text] IZVESTIYA (No. 111) published the other day an article by Doctor of Historical Sciences A. Kiva called "'Union' of Obsessives"—a political portrait of the Soyuz [Union] group of deputies. As was to be expected, the article produced a mixed response, notably in the Union parliament: One deputy described it as extremely tendentious; another, on the contrary, considered it completely objective. V. Alksnis, cochairman of the Soyuz group, has also responded to the article. The IZVESTIYA editorial office received a letter from him which reads as follows:

"I request that my response to A. Kiva's article carried in IZVESTIYA No. 111 be published under the title 'Answering Back for the Union.'

"It seems to me that the status of People's Deputy of the USSR and of the Latvian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] and cochairman of a deputies' group still allows me to count on such publication, particularly as it concerns a distorted interpretation of the activity of deputies in IZVESTIYA SOVETOV NARODNYKH DEPUTATOV SSSR (paradoxical though that may be).

"Esteemed Aleksey Vasilyevich, I would like to continue the discussion on the Soyuz movement that you started (IZVESTIYA No. 111, 1991). I much regret that the editorial office assigned you the ambiguous role of unscrupulous interpreter of the stance of the Soyuz group of deputies and movement: It would have been more logical to publish their program documents so that readers got to know Soyuz members' assessment of the situation in the country and the ways they propose to overcome the crisis without intermediaries. At the very least, the cochairmen of the Soyuz group of deputies could have been asked to offer explanation and amplification. However, this was not done either.

"Methods of debate which are not accepted among intelligent people are widely employed in modern current affairs writing. The deliberate attribution of a false opinion to an opponent, presented, moreover, in a travestied, caricatured way, which then enables you then to deliver a brilliant knockout, is the most widespread. Nor do these writers, in so doing, neglect to demonstrate a certain condescension ('Why do you think that, officers?'). You, Aleksey Vasilyevich, did not avoid the temptation of using such devices either.

"So, down to the nitty-gritty. The key question is the attitude to the draft Union treaty. Right now the legal system is completely disorganized. When mutually contradictory Union and republic laws operate simultaneously in the country, no laws operate, and it is lawlessness which reigns. The 'law wars' unleashed last spring and summer by the radical wing of the National Democrats has greatly complicated (if not precluded altogether) the constitutional road to political reform. The conclusion of the Union treaty will transform the confrontation between the center and republics into a four-cornered conflict: the center, the republics which have signed the treaty, the republics which have not signed it, and the autonomous formations. The key question will become the legitimacy of the existing USSR Supreme Soviet. The Democrats insist on its dissolution after the conclusion of the Union treaty. But there is not a word said about the legal mechanism for this action, or do they have seaman Zheleznyak [famous anarchist] in mind? In any event the existing legislation gives them no other option.

"The Congress of People's Deputies and the USSR Supreme Soviet have from the outset been congenitally incapable of becoming an effective representative organ—a parliament, that is. And the two-tier system, the representation from public organizations, and other contrivances have had the aim of creating a tame, tractable quasiparliament decorated with outward democratic trappings. The enterprise has succeeded, and we have harbored no illusions on that score. The body of deputies we have today does not reflect the real correlation of political forces in society. But this is no way means that we should deal with it by dissolving the Congress and the Supreme Soviet. First, this can only be done by coercion, outside lawful procedures, and that will mean nothing other than a coup. Second, if this happens, society will be split definitively. The 'conservatives' and perhaps part of the Army will 'remain loyal' to the old Congress, the radicals will create their own, new Center, while the majority will again be assigned the role of extras and again find themselves consigned, in grammarians' language, to the passive voice.

"Incidentally, there is no point in your imputing to us the intention of carrying out a coup d'etat (although it is clear whom that passage is aimed at—the president and the state security system—don't miss a trick, eh). I would stress once again that we support solely the democratic path of reforms within the framework of the constitution, and even emergency, long-needed measures to get us out of the impasse should not envisage arbitrary rule. And as for dismissing the Congress, the dissolution of the State Duma was in Russian history precisely a coup d'etat, and the Bolsheviks did something similar with the Constituent Assembly. So there are precedents, and it is clear whose experience the Democrats are adopting.

"And last, the Union treaty. If you don't mind, I'll put this in the form of a question. As people know, in the referendum, despite all the finagling with the wording submitted to the ballot, an absolute majority of USSR citizens favored a federation. Is it democratic to ignore the will of the voters and sign a treaty which while formally proposing international legal relations among the republics, in practice offers relations which are confederal but in no way federal?

"'Prisons,' 'bloodletting,' 'the curbing of inordinate democracy,' and the 'salutary role of violence' form part of the group portrait of the Soyuz movement that you draw. But what can you say here: Bind me for I have killed? It would be possible to laugh it off and to decline to exonerate oneself by responding to such ludicrous charges. But the intention of establishing a dictatorship is imputed to me personally, and that partakes of political provocation.

"I would remind people of the background. At a time when the existing structures of Union power had demonstrated their complete ineffectiveness I put forward the idea (at the Congress of Deputies!) of forming an interim, streamlined, effective and authoritative center of power representing all political forces (except for left-wing and right-wing extremists) and all republics, vested with both legislative and executive powers. Guarantees were provided to prevent this emergency organ getting out of society's control. Such ideas began to be sounded by Democrats somewhat later. It was proposed, in particular, that all power in the USSR be transferred to the Federation Council.

"In this situation you, Aleksey Vasilyevich, call to mind that matchless parodist Aleksandr Ivanov who, writing recently in NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA, said in this regard that we should not reject outright the need for dictators—it all depends on what ideas govern them and in whose interests they act. If a dictator puts good, democratic intentions into effect, there is one yardstick of assessment. If he does not forgo the choice made in October and the communist perspective, a different yardstick is employed.

"Yes, I am becoming increasingly convinced that politics is a dirty business. Time and again I have to stress: I am against dictatorship in the sense of coercion unrestrained by any laws. But I am also against a vague, inert, and compliant policy of sitting on the fence. The dynamic development of events demands an active search for political solutions, although the authorities' armory must also have methods based on strength.

"As for the amorphous and contradictory nature of the Soyuz movement, here I wholly agree with you. The movement arose not as an independent political force but because of the poverty of the center's policy and the nonsensical ideas of the national democrats. And, unfortunately, at present no one but Soyuz is concerned about protecting the rights of nonindigenous nationalities in the republics, no one realizes the danger of the disintegration of the Union or the possible catastrophic consequences of the random development of events. It is not a matter of our perspicacity. It is simpler than that—the majority of us live in those regions where the situation of the future has developed.

"Yes, you are right, among the cochairmen of the Soyuz group of deputies there are no eminent academics who have written a dissertation on developed socialism, the historiography of France, or the U.S. Congress, no rent-a-quote economists, no celebrated poets, no ex-world champion weight lifters. Woe! Believe me, we would be glad to have acknowledged leaders at our helm, but the idea of the Union is not in vogue among today's leaders. You write that Blokhin, Alksnis, Kogan, Petrushenko, and others do not enjoy prestige or trust in society and that they are motivated by nothing but personal ambitions. I cannot let you get away with that. The USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of Oriental Studies, even its best representatives, cannot pass judgment on that, especially without offering arguments and using hysterical tones. The elections will show that, and there are a number of signs that the voters will side with us.

"Furthermore, I would be perfectly happy if the political parties which are emerging and gaining strength were seriously concerned about the interests of Soyuz' members, if they amended their programs and removed the tension which has developed on national-state questions. But this is not happening, and we must occupy our historically-allotted position of defending the interests of USSR citizens.

"'It is simply ludicrous to propose myself in place of Gorbachev and his team'—yet another example of misrepresentation. In fact, like any political force, Soyuz claims the right to participate, within the framework of democratic procedures, in shaping and implementing state policy, but only in a coalition with parties and movements aware of their responsibility for the Union and safeguarding the rights and interests of all its citizens. However, this principled position of ours is certainly not synonymous with claims to monopoly power with a homogeneous government (we are realists, after all). As for M.S. Gorbachev's team, we are ready to share responsibility for the policy of the USSR leadership if it is indeed going to pursue a policy rather than merely imitate it.

"Of course, this rejoinder to your article does not exhaust the discussion. I hope that it will continue."

[Editorial note] The editorial office complied with V. Alksnis' request and passed his letter on to A. Kiva.

[Kiva reply] The very fact that V. Alksnis, cochairman of the Soyuz deputies' group, has responded to my article indicates, I believe, that this discussion is beneficial and timely. Naturally, I did not expect the Soyuz leaders to agree entirely with the way I see that movement. On the contrary, I am becoming increasingly convinced that there is no adequate understanding of the present situation in the country, the causes of the most profound social crisis, or ways to extricate us from the historical impasse to be found within Soyuz, insofar as it is possible to reduce the different tendencies there to a common denominator. And mistakes here can be tantamount to national tragedy.

In the article I tried to express not so much my position, as the serious concern of many of our citizens at Soyuz attempts to impose on the country a false understanding of the situation and a false way to resolve the problems. I shall cite here the comment of Soyuz Cochairman A. Chekhoyev that "urgent intervention is needed—call it surgical if you want, but can you have surgery without pain"? What are those words supposed to mean?

I did not present a one-sided picture of Soyuz. I believe its appearance to be an objective fact. I do not doubt the sincerity of the intentions of many Soyuz members. But the most diverse forces are involved in the movement, which complicates not only the assessment of it but also its assessment of itself.

As for my experience as an orientalist, it is of great help to me at present. I have seen for myself in Third World countries how rivers of blood flowed because of mistaken decisions or in order to rescue ramshackle ideological dogmas. Ultimately life prevailed, but what a terrible price was paid for that experience.

As for not missing a trick... I regard debate in that tone as a sign of bad taste. Furthermore this takes place, as a rule, in the silence of an office, not through a newspaper with a circulation of millions.

I am against confrontation and for a better understanding of the motives of this or that public movement's activity. I support the rapprochement, not the disuniting of our citizens. I support a joint search for ways to achieve civil peace and national accord. I want our discussions to enter a civilized course. And I do not want my article to be taken as an attack on Soyuz or V. Alksnis' letter as an attempt to shield that deputies' group from criticism.

Party Must Come to Terms With Perestroyka

PM2005162791 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 13 May 91 Second Edition pp 1-2

["Publicist's Notes" by Aleksandr Ilin: "Who 'Invented' Perestroyka"]

[Excerpts] One might have guessed that perestroyka would be reviled, and savagely so.

Still better, foreseen. A stoked fire not only gives off more heat but burns more fiercely. To every action—according to the laws of mechanics—there is a reaction, and the reaction here is sometimes crushing.

Who knows whether the prime movers of perestroyka would have had the willpower to go ahead if they had known for certain that events would develop this way? That they would not only be reproached for their mistakes in helping to correct any perestroyka defects on the fly, but would be suspected of dishonest intentions? That they would be called to account having first been pronounced guilty. And not after having left the top posts, which used to be a kind of sick tradition with us, but—entirely in the spirit of perestroyka—at the very height of the renovation of our rather dilapidated home. [passage omitted]

How do you explain the loss of faith in perestroyka? Incidentally, this too should have been expected. Except, I cannot agree with those who who see apparatus machinations all over the place—be it the party, state, or economic apparatus, its dead hand clinging to power and privileges as they slip away. Although this sort of thing is indeed happening, it is not the prime cause. In my view, we do not have the new bureaucratic class that the young Leningrad political scientist-cum-journalist—now, incidentally , effectively forgotten—made a name for himself tracking down. Is that not why many other "wordsmiths" who took various soviet elections by storm to the accompaniment of deafening criticism of the old bureaucracy soon turned into even more sophisticated bureaucrats?

It is a matter, if you will excuse the tautology, of our general inability to deal with the matter. To organize, adjust, complete. V.I. Lenin made an ironic comment about his compatriots: While capable of conceiving and carrying out a revolution of massive proportions, we pussyfoot around the most trivial bureaucratic reform. And he warned: Enough of the political prattle; we must get down to some regular spadework. And he urged Communists to learn how to govern. We still have not learned properly, it appears. And it is scant consolation that our opponents, let us say, who only recently were demanding that the CPSU give them the wheel, have turned out—now that they have their own hands on the wheel—to be even less competent "drivers."

The defects due to incompetence are most apparent in the economy. But not everyone realizes that perestroyka is not to blame—not alone, at any rate—for our failures. Otto Latsis, in his article "Cold Turkey" (IZVESTIYA, 7 May), investigated the roots of economic ills, gave—among other conclusions —a simple and therefore for many incomprehensible and unpleasant recipe for remedying them: hard work. Not a novel conclusion, of course, but it has to be said. Of course, hard work deserves incentives. Incentives for labor, for its quality and usefulness. But if we want to live independently, like, say, the Swedes, we—all of us!—must learn to work like the Swedes. There is no argument here. I might add: or like their neighbors, the Danes, or the Swiss, or the Germans... I mention those whom I have seen at work.

And not only in plant shops, in shipyards, and on construction sites are they able to work properly. I saw how well matters were organized in the parliaments there, in city councils, and local councils, how efficiently work was organized in the ruling parties, how they liaised with governments and other organs of power. How ably the trade unions protected working people's interests. Finally, how my journalist colleagues operated, how bewildered they were to hear that for many Soviet press workers the concept of glasnost means that anything goes and all moral standards go out the window...

I would not want to overestimate foreign ways—I did encounter poverty, unemployment, and terrorism abroad. And not everything here is inferior—it does not become us to demean ourselves, to forget our social gains, which have also influenced working people's lives in these countries. But, there is no doubt that we have much to learn if we want to avoid falling even further behind the highly developed countries. We must bring together every atom, all our best forces, so that in taking advice from others we lose neither our own distinctiveness and good traditions, nor our people's amazing ability, worthy of the highest praise, to emerge honorably from any ordeal.

But it is time many "traditions" were abandoned altogether. For example, the impatience that prevents us, ever in a hurry, from at least completing something. We must stop indulging in petty skirmishes, where a local "foreman's" error is given all-union significance or typical mismanagement in a city or at a plant is depicted in terms of the inevitable failure of a grand, but allegedly false, idea.

It is not surprising, although it should be, when former CPSU member Professor of Economics G.Kh. Popov, on becoming a deputy and chairman of Moscow City Soviet, accuses Lenin of misleading him with the slogan "All Power to the Soviets!" Whereas the soviets, explained Popov, who had exploited this slogan to the utmost in the election campaign, are incapable of anything positive. Surely the true democrat does not intend to return to a new-style administrative-edict system, does he? (Incidentally, he invented the term). Gavriil Kharitonovich has now parted company with Lenin, so that is clear enough. But, Vladimir Ilich did not anticipate that Prof. Popov and others of that ilk would be sitting in the soviets. He was writing and talking about the organs of people's power established back in the years of the first Russian revolution by the workers themselves. It was inconceivable to Lenin that there would be practically no place for workers and peasants. In fact, he put forward his slogan in a specific situation, and was not afraid to abandon it when the soviets were bossed by Mensheviks and Socialist Revolutionaries whose leaders, as members of the Provisional Government, sanctioned its antipopular activity.

Well, to hell with them, yesterday's men: What is perestroyka to them? What are they to perestroyka? They had their way before 1985; neither did they waste there time afterwards. At least, it is now clear who is who and for what we have to thank perestroyka.

But when party workers who only recently were saying that "The party is the guarantor of perestroyka" start to disparage it, that is something different.

No, I am not insisting that even now—once we have been named as guarantors—we are obliged to romantically celebrate the "April winds," while turning a blind eye to the difficulties and mistakes, to the fact that many expectations and hopes have been dashed. That the promised acceleration, which, to be honest, was not very credible to begin with, did not take place. It was not without reason that not only the inveterate skeptics mocked the latest party slogan: Car drivers are well aware, they said, what happens when you accelerate on a tight bend.

It is no secret that today's crisis is rooted not only in the mire of the past but also in the errors of recent years. This has cost the party dear, and it is still paying a heavy price for the mistakes. Where is the romance in this...

Can we do anything without going from one extreme to the other? Does it have to be one or the other? One minute we are in rapture, the next minute we are nullifying and rejecting—is that a sign of wisdom, I ask you? Is it not more honest to admit: OK, it didn't work; OK, we blew it, and take responsibility for it. We have, after all, learned a great deal during these years and have come to understand many things. Above all that the entire party, the millions of Communists must participate in the elaboration of party policy and in its implementation. We have the right to do this, and the duty. It is time to learn and to work! People will no longer take our—Communists' —word for it.

As I write, I keep feeling that these are trivial matters, truisms. Yet how hard it can be to understand even simple truths! It is far more tempting once again to find a scapegoat and blame him for all the ills. For the deficiencies of glasnost, for the disintegration of the Union, for the blood of innocent people who have been victims of interethnic conflicts, for that desire to "return to world civilization," which unfortunately brought our country not only the trust of the world but also the loss of former allies in the countries of East Europe. For the procession of sovereignties, for the war of laws, and so on and so forth.

Well, enough of that: Is one person capable of doing all that, even if he is a member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee? Yet that is the gist of the criticism leveled by G. Zyuganov in SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA at A.N. Yakovlev in an open letter bearing the scathing headline: "The Architect at the Ruins."

To be frank, I too have some difficult questions for Aleksandr Nikolayevich Yakovlev. When, during the 28th congress, copies of a synopsis—described by him as an "anonymous letter"—of his conversation with young delegates were being passed round, there was one particular phrase that struck a discordant note: Perestroyka will go ahead regardless, with or without the CPSU. The anonynmous author of the synopsis has distorted the idea. But the text published 10 July 1990 by KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA, purportedly a genuine stenographic account, said approximately the same thing: Perestroyka will develop all the same—with or without the party. Is it appropriate for one of the leaders of the CPSU—and he was still a member of the Politburo and a Central Committee secretary at the time—to be so imprudent in what he says? So perestroyka no longer really needs a guarantor? I thought to myself: Evidently this was Aleksandr Nikolayevich's way of stressing the need for the party to undergo swifter renewal and democratization, in order not to fall behind, not to be left out of the perestroyka processes. But one could not avoid the interpretation that A.N. Yakovlev, of all people, knows how to express his thoughts clearly. Furthermore: If he rejected the "synopsis's" assertion, no explanations were forthcoming in connection with what was published in KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA...

In the latest issue of MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI the chief editor of this ostentatiously "independent newspaper" names—first, in fact—Aleksandr Yakovlev among those who have recently been showing an "increasingly active interest" in the creation of a constructive opposition, one "whose authority could contribute to the birth of a mass party with its own structure and local branches and its own publications." We are talking about a party "which, in terms of its significance, could be an alternative to the CPSU." How is one supposed to take that, pray tell? Is the editor bluffing, or what? Does A.N. Yakovlev know his namesake in MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI intends to exploit the authority of a recent CPSU leader in that way and what does he think about it?

Many questions, in short. There are also grounds for criticism of a position adopted during a difficult time for the party, of the pluses and minuses of the "ideological backup for perestroyka."

But why does Zyuganov's article instill in me a sense of alarm, rather than satisfaction? It is not, in fact, the diatribe-like tone, the caustic expressions he uses, the factual innaccuracies. My feeling is that the "letter" was not written to get even with a former party figure —it spread its net wider. Then what is the author aim? OK, we debunk the "architect," and then what—deal with the "foremen," the smaller fry? Expose and pillory—it is nothing new; we have a wealth of historical experience of this. So the republic Supreme Soviets will revoke their declarations of sovereignty, will they? The bloodshed will cease in Nagorno-Karabakh and on the border between Armenia and Azerbaijan? The Balts will think again and revert to their former status? Glasnost will cease to be inconvenient to certain people?

I do not believe that Gennadiy Andreyevich Zyuganov thinks that. Not to face up to reality, to hope for a replay, a return, as some are already proposing, to the status quo before 1985—it would be living in the realm of illusions. Rivers do not flow backward, and the same goes for life. What is needed, then? What will help us escape from the crisis situation with dignity? How do you solve the "hot" questions politically and avert the tragedy that threatens the country? The Communists and the Communist Party of Russia, also created, incidentally, in the years of perestroyka and not without its influence—what can they and must they do to that end? The author of the "open letter," a member of the Politburo and secretary of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic Communist Party Central Committee, does not address these problems here, alas.

Although negation is also a stance. But I cannot believe that the solution is to renounce democratization, glasnost, "the new thinking," and so on, even if certain people are averse to these things. To renounce everything that is now part of the warp and woof and therefore is something we are not always aware of, as if it has ever been so and seemingly could not be otherwise. I do not believe this could be renounced! It would be suicide for a party which, after the shock that is bound to occur in such upheavals, is only just finding itself again in the new conditions: political pluralism and the need to assert its authority at democratic soviet elections; actively, by persuasion rather than by order, to perform in the soviets the hard spadework that was forgotten during the years of monopolism; to learn the ABCs of realpolitik.

Why pretend that someone has brought all our current misfortunes upon us, sowing dragon's teeth instead of good seed. Perestroyka was not "invented" —it was life that confronted the party and the people with a choice. And it was not only the party leaders who took upon their shoulders the labor of perestroyka in 1985. We all embarked on it, although without a very clear picture of the scale and nature of the overdue changes, the ruts and potholes that lay in wait for us on the unexplored path. But we should have thought hard about it all, and then we might have been able to foresee many things and avoid many errors. The party is entitled to take its lookouts to task over this. But so must everyone take himself to task. And very severely. So—to work!

We have a mountain of work before us. The party has plenty of opponents, too. They have it in their sights. They notice our every mistake. They are out to get the party leaders and its rank and file, who, I believe, are the only ones who can ultimately secure success for the CPSU in the very fierce political struggle. If, that is, they avoid being passive observers of the "battle at the top" and get together to correct the errors that have ensued from our general incompetence, do what remains undone, and get closer to the noble goals people believed in at the start of perestroyka. They are still waiting and hoping, although they are beginning to lose patience. They are perplexed by the fact that all manner of scoundrel has been able to enjoy the fruits of the changes sooner than the working people. This cannot be allowed.

We have had no end of claimants to the title of architect and supervisor of perestroyka. Today it needs the skilled man. It needs the working people.

Results of Poll on Obstacles to Democratization

PM1705145191 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 13 May 91 Union Edition p 2

[Report by Aleksey Levinson under the "Opinion Poll" rubric: "Who is Preventing Us From Living Well"]

[Text] The All-Union Center for the Study of Public Opinion put the following question to 2,000 citizens all over the country: "What, in your view, is now the main obstacle to democratic transformations in the Soviet Union?"

More than 20 percent of respondents had difficulty in choosing between the six "political" answers and the one neutral answer: As far as they are concerned, absolutely everything is to blame, although the main factor is the "antagonism between the center and the republics" (30 percent).

The majority, however, preferred to be more specific in their response. Some described the "actions of separatists in the union republics" as an obstacle to democracy, while others felt the problem lay in "opposition by the union leadership." Across Russia and the USSR as a whole, the second version was chosen more than twice as often as the first. And in Lithuania it was chosen 19 times more often. One can imagine what kind of "opposition" by the union leadership they had in mind....

At one time, Lithuania had the highest level of confidence in the union leadership. But now it has almost the lowest in the whole country. The same picture emerges, incidentally, among population groups belonging to the same nationality: Among Russians, for example. Those who used to be the center's main supporters in its efforts to democratically transform the country now form the main opposition to it. The reverse is also true: Those who rejected "perestroyka" and "democratization" in their original form now provide the social base of the center.

For many people, however, it is becoming clear that not very much now depends on what is meant by the word "center." Whether it likes it or not, the "center" has called into the political arena social forces that are in opposition to one another. (In fact, they say that the "center" has served its purpose and can quit the stage).

Opposition from the "party authorities, Army leadership, and military-industrial complex" is the main obstacle to democratic transformations: This is the most frequently chosen version of the politically definite answers. Moreover, young people choose this version more often than elderly people; men more often than women; educated people more often than less educated people; and so forth.

A considerable number of people said that the main obstacle to democracy is lack of unity in the actions of "democratic forces." In Georgia this answer was given three to four times less often than in other republics, and in neighboring Azerbaijan—three to four times more often. Almost half of all Azerbaijani respondents agree that people are disappointed in the success of society's democratization, whereas only 2 percent of Lithuanians hold that opinion.

There is also another opinion: The main obstacle to democratization is that "the majority of the population is not ready to live in a democratic society." Whose is this opinion? The "majority's"? No, the majority usually points to obstacles emanating from the party authorities, military leadership, and the military-industrial complex. However, "minority groups" in our selection—members of the CPSU (8 percent), leading workers (3 percent), and some groups of the military (2 percent)—mainly reject this story about the military-industrial complex and, on the contrary, maintain 2-2.5 times more often than the "majority" that Soviet society is not ready for democracy. Should we wait until they say that it is "ready"?

Incidentally, one in 11 members of the CPSU believes that an obstacle to democratic transformations is "opposition by the party authorities."

Army, Church Head Popularity Poll

LD1705121491 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 2200 GMT 16 May 91

[From the "Television News Service" program]

[Text] Moscow institute of social and political technologies has completed its work on a broad opinion poll. The socially active forces of Russia and the conditions and ways for their consolidation were studied. Today we begin to show you its first results. For example, people were invited to answer this question: In what measure do you put your trust in various social institutions in our society? Without resorting to sociological exercises we present you the following list.

At the top of the list, as you see, is the Soviet Army. This was unexpected. The second is the church—which is somehow understandable. The opinion poll was carried out in the 25 largest cities and regions of the Russian Federation. Almost 17,000 people participated in the poll and, separately, 2,000 experts. It seems that alongside with the general crisis which is already gripping the country we are witnessing a crisis of confidence. We hope that at least the Army and the church will be able to avoid it. [video shows the following list in order of priority]

1. The Army
2. The Church
3. Chairman of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] Supreme Soviet
4. RSFSR government
5. RSFSR Supreme Soviet
6. Trade unions
7. KGB
8. Militia
9. USSR president
10. USSR Supreme Soviet
11. USSR government
12. RSFSR Communist Party Central Committee
13. CPSU Central Committee

MVD People's Deputies Form Policeman's Club

PM1705100591 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 16 May 91 First Edition p 3

[Correspondent Major S. Knyazkov report under the "Direct Line" rubric: "MVD Personnel Deputies Club Set Up"]

[Text] Moscow—Two law-enforcement organ workers are USSR people's deputies, 93 are union and autonomous republic deputies, and thousands work in the local soviets.

The ministry leadership met with representatives of the corps of deputies—militia personnel and internal troops officers—14 May at the USSR MVD [Ministry of Internal Affairs] Collegium conference hall. Yu. Golik, chairman of the USSR Presidential Committee To Coordinate the Activity of Law-Enforcement Organs, Yu. Kalmykov, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Legislation and Law and Order Committee, V. Kravtsov, USSR deputy prosecutor general, A. Filatov, deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Court, and lawyer academics took part in its work.

The report delivered by Colonel General I. Shilov, first deputy minister of internal affairs, contained alarming figures. Last year the increase in crime reached the highest level in the postwar period, totaling 2.78 million. This year it has not proved possible to halt this process. There has been a considerable increase in crime in Estonia, Armenia, the Mari, Chuvash, and Udmurt ASSR's [Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republics], Maritime Kray, and Omsk, Vladimir, Nizhegorod, Kamchatka, Novosibirsk, and Kaluga Oblasts.

Crime has also become more aggressive. In 1990 members of the patrol and guard service used their weapons 2.5 times more often than in 1989. This year weapons have been used more than 300 times to suppress illegal actions. At the same time more than 44,000 firearms and more than 1.5 million munitions have been confiscated from criminals to date.

The incessant interethnic conflicts cause law-enforcement organs particular concern. In the last two years alone 1,000 and 7,500 citizens respectively have been killed and wounded in clashes, while 700,000 have become refugees.

The meeting decided to set up a deputies club for personnel from law-enforcement organs.

Interior Ministry on Victims of Ethnic Conflicts

LD2005173291 Moscow TASS in English 1554 GMT 20 May 91

[Text] Moscow May 20 TASS—The number of victims killed in ethnic conflicts continues to rise, Interior Ministry officials told TASS here today. About 200 people were killed and 700 wounded since the start of this year. Over 40 law enforcement officers and Interior Ministry troops were killed in the line of duty, protecting innocent residents.

Ethnic prejudices are growing. According to socialogical investigations, this feeling is entertained by 50 per cent of the country's population and in some areas 80 per cent. This creates an explosive situation and new seats of tension.

The threat to life, health and well-being has become an every-day reality for millions of people.

Ethnic strife increased flows of refugees. Their number has reached 700,000. This problem has exacerbated social difficulties in the northern Caucasus, the Krasnodar territory and several regions in the Ukraine and the Russian Federation.

More than 1,200 people were killed and 10,000 wounded over the past three years. Direct material damage topped six billion rubles.

'Informal Groups' Blamed for 1989 Tbilisi Violence

OW2105051491 Moscow INTERFAX in English 0930 GMT 20 May 91

[Text] The USSR prosecutor-general Nikolay Trubin has sent to the Supreme Soviet another memorandum concerning investigations into the events that took place in Tbilisi on April 9, 1989. According to him, responsibility for the disturbances lies on the informal associations "Iliya Chavchavadze Society", "Iliya the Righteous Society", "Helsinki Group", party of National Independence for Georgian [as received], Georgia's National Democratic party, Georgia's National Christian party and Georgia's National Justice party. At that time their membership totalled some 3000 people.

By April, 1989, says the prosecutor-general in his memorandum, the leaders of these organizations, including Zviad Gamsakhurdia, had conducted about 30 unauthorized meetings, demonstrations and political strikes. As a result public order in Tbilisi and other Georgian cities was systematically violated. There were attempts to forcibly stage walkouts at plants and factories, paralyse normal course of life, and disrupt the work of public transport.

Taking advantage of their impunity and inactivity of law-enforcers, in early April they sharply stepped up their unconstitutional activity designed to destabilize politico-public life in the republic, says the prosecutor-general. Therefore, he concludes, the entire responsibility for the consequences of the April 9 events in Tbilisi, such as the blood of innocent victims, lies fully on the conscience of those who organized the illegal political action. Their activity should be qualified as incitement of mass unrest and kindling of ethnic hatred and discord.

Heir to Throne 'Prepared To Serve Russia'

PM1705150591 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 14 May 91 Union Edition p 7

[A. Bovin article: "Their Highnesses and Their Majesties... Notes in the Margins of History"]

[Text] Perestroyka is, without doubt, a process common to everyone. Anyone can try to build what he wants to build. A monarchist spirit has now crept into the atmosphere which is heavy with pluralism: The idea of a Russian monarchy has been revived. Apparently there is even a monarchist party. Still unofficial. But time will not wait: Neo-monarchist "representatives of Moscow" are establishing contacts with the heir to the Russian throne, His Imperial Highness Grand Duke Vladimir Kirillovich Romanov.

Vladimir Kirillovich is the grand nephew of Nikolay II. He was born in Finland 30 August 1917. He has never lived in Russia.

"What is now happening in Russia is very important," the heir to the throne said. "We have been waiting 70 years for this." He is prepared to come to the Soviet Union if he receives an invitation "from the very top." Going on the basis of conversations he has had with "emissaries" from Moscow, Vladimir Kirillovich says there is "total confusion" in the Soviet Union and believes that "citizens there dream of returning to a monarchy, without even considering the form it will take. They perceive the very idea of a monarchy as the solution to the problems which engulf the nation...."

The grand duke himself is prepared to serve Russia in any form. "It need not be on the throne."

This situation—a kind of monarchist renaissance—is now typical of virtually every former monarchy which has passed through the stage of socialist totalitarianism and is trying to discover new forms of social life.

For example, the son of former Albanian King Zog, who calls himself Leka I, has clearly swung into action. His permanent place of residence is the Republic of South Africa. He reminded people of his existence in early 1990 by visiting Paris, London, and Washington. In January 1991, the pretender to the Albanian throne gave an exclusive interview to the Yugoslav weekly NOVOSTI-8. Leka I said that he is prepared to return to Albania at any moment, introduce a free market there, and establish civil liberties.

The former king of Romania, Michael, (who holds the Soviet Order of Victory, incidentally) has also awoken from his lethargic sleep. He did not bother to wait for an invitation, however. In November 1990, the former king flew into Bucharest from Switzerland in breach of visa regulations. But he was immediately turned back.

Bulgarian Tsar Simeon II, who lives in Spain, has also stirred to life. He was crowned in 1943 at six years of age. His sister Princess Mariya-Luiza, daughter of Tsar Boris III who lives permanently in the United States, arrived in Sofia on a private visit in early May. At Sofia Airport the crowd rapturously chanted "Long Live the Tsar!"

In the opinion of Simeon II, the question of whether Bulgaria is to be a republic or a monarchy should be decided in a referendum.

There are also reports that Aleksandr Karageorgevic, son of Yugoslav King Petr II, plans to visit Belgrade.

So that is how things stand.

Evidently the Monomakh Crown [ceremonial crown symbolizing czarist rule in Russia] is considerably lighter at the end of the 20th century than it was at the beginning of the 12th century.

USSR: Deputy Premier on Drop in Food Production

LD2105145391 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1349 GMT 21 May 91

[By TASS correspondents Konstantin Voytsekhovich and Aleksandr Kanishchev]

[Text] Moscow, 21 May (TASS)—The volume of food production in the USSR has fallen by 7 percent over the first four months of this year, it was reported at a news conference here today by USSR Deputy Prime Minister Fedor Sinko. Livestock output has fallen most substantially—primarily milk and meat.

In the view of the USSR deputy prime minister, the fall in production has been caused by the rupture of economic links, and also by bad weather conditions for laying in succulent fodder last year.

The USSR Cabinet of Ministers anticrisis program incorporates the prerequisites for rectifying the situation concerning the country's food supplies, Fedor Sinko noted. The main task is to improve the supply of material and technical resources to the agroindustrial complex. Great attention is also being devoted to improving production relations in agriculture—the creation of small leasehold collectives and cooperatives within a large collective and state farms. Work is under way to attract foreign investments to the agricultural sector of the Soviet economy. It is intended that they should be used primarily for new agricultural machines, for the purchase of advanced technology, and for the construction of new enterprises in the processing industry.

Yakutsk Secures More Food From Central Government

OW2005034491 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1230 GMT 18 May 91

[Text] According to Yakutsk council of ministers, it managed to secure a greater quota for good products to be supplied by the USSR Government to Yakutiya this year. The deliveries of meat will rise by 19.7 percent, those of flour by 7.1 percent and those of sugar by 10 percent.

Yakutiya gets 95 percent of its food products from the central government.

In the first 4 months of the current year the sales of all foods in Yakutiya remained on last year's level. Increases were noted only in the sales of fish and salt.

Muscovites Polled on Recent Price Increases

LD2005115191 Moscow TASS in English 1113 GMT 20 May 91

[Text] Moscow May 20 TASS—Fifty-nine percent of Muscovites say the recent price increases were disastrous for their families, according to an opinion poll taken by the "Mneniye" sociological service.

Only 2.8 percent of those polled stick to the classical "no problem" formula that was previously characteristic of Muscovites.

Evaluations of the price hikes fluctuate somewhat depending on respondents' age, inclinations and way of thinking.

Asked whether the increase in the retail prices of food and manufactured goods will help rectify the economic situation in this country, 64 percent answered in the negative.

The most pessimistic sentiments prevail among post-graduates: 80 percent of future scholars are critical of the government's move. The largest number of optimists turned out to be among schoolchildren—almost 18 percent of respondents.

More than 25 percent of elderly people, aged 60 to 64, said confidently that the newly-set prices would improve the economy.

People aged 35-33, or more than 79 percent of respondents, are most strongly critical of the price hikes.

Flow of State Goods to Black Market Increases

LD2005110891 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 0900 GMT 20 May 91

[From the "Television News Service" program]

[Text] According to the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs, the flow of raw materials and manufactured products from the state sector into the illegal sales system for subsequent sale at sufficiently high prices has increased during the last month. The number of such abuses reached 21,000 in May, and the value of goods harbored in cases already uncovered now exceeds 13 million rubles.

Interior Ministry Says Economic Crimes Increasing

OW1505122891 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1807 GMT 14 May 91

[From the "Business Today"]

[Text] According to a high-ranking representative of the Soviet Interior Ministry the number of economic crimes, including corruption, theft and mercenary crimes "is growing steadily in all branches of the national economy." Speaking on May 14 before employees of law-enforcing bodies—people's deputies, the first deputy Interior Minister, Mr Ivan Shilov, also said that the number of "blatant" crimes is also on the increase: These are crimes connected with foreign currency and shares, illegal credits and other banking operations.

The General-Colonel also listed phenomena new for the Soviet Union—the creating of false joint-stock companies and cooperatives. He said that the Ministry is also disturbed by the rise in fraud on an international scale.

According to Ministry information, the annual turnover of black market capital in the Soviet Union is always rising and has reached seventy to eighty billion rubles a year.

State Property Foundation Chairman Appointed

PM1605133191 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 16 May 91 Second Edition p 2

[Decree of USSR president "On the Appointment of Comrade S.A. Assekritov as Chairman of the Board of the USSR State Property Foundation"]

[Text] Appoint Comrade Stanislav Vasilyevich Assekritov chairman of the board of the USSR State Property Foundation.

[signed] USSR President M. Gorbachev, Moscow, Kremlin, 15 May 1991.

Death Figures Among Chernobyl Workers Disputed

LD2005120791 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1110 GMT 20 May 91

[Text] Moscow, 20 May (TASS)—Reports have recently appeared in the USSR and foreign media on the large number of participants in the elimination of the consequences of the accident at the Chernobyl nuclear power station who have died as a result of the effect of ionizing radiation. Thus, the weekly ARGUMENTY I FAKTY gives a report of 7,000-10,000 dead.

Your TASS correspondent has asked the USSR Health Ministry to elucidate this matter. This is what he has been told—145 people have fallen ill with acute radiation sickness, 30 of whom have died; 275,614 participants in the elimination of the consequences of the accident at the station were under observation by medical establishments of the system of the USSR Health Ministry at the end of 1990. According to statistical accounts in the possession of the USSR Health Ministry, 1,065 of these persons died in the Ukraine, Belorussia, and the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic for various reasons in 1990.

Predominant among the causes of death are accidents, poisoning, injuries, and general somatic illnesses, corresponding to the mortality structure among men between the ages of 20 and 49 as a whole in the country.

May Holidays Disrupt Industry, Services

91UN1499A Moscow RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA in Russian 15 May 91 p 2

[Article by RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA staff correspondent in Novosibirsk Vyacheslav Nechipurenko: "Had A Nice Rest? Notes on the Calendar Pages"]

[Text] *Any step taken by the Cabinet of Ministers these days falls under the category of unpopular. There are exceptions though. The resolution on moving the May Day holidays did not draw salvos of criticism; it could hardly do so since it was adopted "for the purpose of creating favorable conditions for the working people to rest." As a result, it ended up being a whole week of rest. The question is, was it favorable for every one of us and for the country as a whole?*

I know I have numerous opponents, but I will still share some of my observations in this respect. To me, the May Day holidays seemed to be less a holiday than some sort of legalized holiday bacchanalia. I could not get my salary for three days—the post office was closed. On the fourth day the post office did not have the money since the Savings Bank was closed. Many Novosibirsk citizens found themselves thoroughly confused. With the frivolous interpretations of the law (let alone resolutions!) these days, try to figure out when some or another enterprise is resting, when it is celebrating, and when it is operating but in a shortened pre-holiday mode. One could get the impression that during the first four days of May people did not live, were not born, nor died in this city. All they did was enjoy their rest. On 2 May a good and honored man died in one of the institutes. One would want to express condolences and notify the people of the time of the memorial service. Well, it cannot be done. Local papers were not published for two days. For two days—1 and 2 May—most kiosks of Soyuzpechat [Main Administration for the Distribution of Print Media of the USSR Ministry of Communications] were closed. They opened only on 3 May when neither central nor local papers were published. What did they sell? The 1 and 2 May newspapers! It seems that in this most difficult time, when we need to soberly appraise what is happening today and no less soberly foresee what is awaiting us tomorrow, we still live by the logic of not even yesterday, but of the day before yesterday.

Otherwise, there is no explanation as to why the postal service, information services, polyclinics, and even some enterprises that had never been inclined to be idle, make themselves holidays. The latter, however, have an explanation. "We could send the entire plant on vacation," I was told at Sibselmash [Siberian Agricultural Machine Building Works], "since all contract deliveries fell through. Our suppliers let us down, and we are letting our customers down." One can see some kind of a diabolic circle emerge, with tens of enterprises in the city on the verge of forced idling because hundreds of others, scattered all over the country, are striking, rallying, or settling ethnic relations. The inaction of some leads to the idling of others. Then the latter, in turn, bring still others to the brink of bankruptcy.

I tried to find out the extent of the losses to the city during this holiday week. It turned out that the oblast statistics administration does not keep track of such things anymore. In the administration of Sibakademstroy [Construction Administration of the USSR Academy of Sciences Siberian Branch] I was told with some bitterness that extended holidays make people lax and lead to the decline in professional skills. I was given an interesting figure in the Building and Erection Directorate No. 3 of the same administration. During the holidays, engineering and technical staff were on round-the-clock duty at empty sites. These guard hours are added to their vacation leave. As a result, they accumulated 24 work days. That is full vacation time for a staff engineer position. This is in just one administration; how many such administrations and offices are around the country where people were to watchfully man duty desks during the holidays? In short, I have not learned much about losses from the statisticians, but my opponents did give me some idea as to what the city obtained from the well-known resolution of the Cabinet of Ministers.

TASS Reviews Soviet Central Press

18 May

LD1805085291 Moscow TASS in English 0631 GMT 18 May 91

["Press Review"—TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow May 18 TASS—Today's leading newspapers continue to give extensive coverage to the visit to the Soviet Union by Chinese Communist Party leader Jiang Zemin. The press describes his visit to Moscow's Likhachev motor factory, his meeting with representatives of the Soviet public and a news conference, which summed up the results of his stay in Moscow.

Describing the present talks with the Soviet leaders, Jiang stressed that "the two sides came to the same conclusion: Relations based on the five principles of peaceful co-existence are developing and will develop in the spirit of friendship and good-neighbourly contacts".

The press reports that the Soviet Soyuz TM-12 spaceship will be launched today. The Soviet-British team will include British citizen Helen Sharman. It is planned that the Soyuz will dock to the Mir space station on May 20.

Pravda describes the crew of the Soyuz TM-12 spaceship. The KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA newspaper also carries a dispatch from London where Sharman's parents gave a news conference at the Soviet Embassy.

Pravda features an article describing "the portrait" of former Lithuanian Communist Party leader Algirdas Brazauskas, who has now become leader of the Lithuanian Democratic Party of Labour.

The newspaper reveals reasons for the transformation of views by "the long-standing party functionary of the stagnation period", who is now attacking Communist views.

The KRASNAYA ZVEZDA newspaper sharply censures a private visit to the United States by Eduard Shevardnadze. The newspaper believes that the course pursued by the former Soviet Foreign Minister helped weaken the Soviet Union and enabled the United States to advance "its claims to interfere in Soviet domestic affairs".

Criticising Shevardnadze's present trip to the United States, the newspaper draws the conclusion that "private diplomats" will not save the country from hunger.

20 May PRAVDA

LD2005070691 Moscow TASS in English 0601 GMT 20 May 91

["Soviet Press Review"—TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow May 20 TASS—PRAVDA publishes a joint Sino- Soviet communique on the results of Chinese Communist Party leader Jiang Zemin's official visit to the Soviet Union.

Jiang visited the Soviet Union at the invitation of President Mikhail Gorbachev from May 15 to 19.

The Soviet Union and China "are prepared to develop friendly, good-neighbourly and profitable cooperation in the interest of the two nations, peace and stability in the world," the statement says.

In an editorial comment PRAVDA praised the communique as a new landmark in the history of Sino-Soviet relations.

"Meetings between supreme leaders of our states in Beijing and Moscow show that normalisation in Soviet-Chinese relations is not a return to the past, to allied bonds of the 1950s. It is the birth of a new model of relations that allows two major socialist states to move forward into the 21st century more resolutely. Figuratively speaking, this is a return to the future," PRAVDA writes.

Ph.D. V. Korobeynikov comments on the presidential campaign in the Russian Federation. The forthcoming congress of people's deputies in Russia should upgrade election laws and review the election date, Korobeynikov believes.

PRAVDA reports tensions in Belorussia in the run up to a parliamentary session. A strike committee set up in Minsk has demanded that parliament pass a decision to depoliticise ruling bodies, de-partycise production collectives and nationalise Communist Party property.

The attempt to remove communists from parliament and other ruling bodies, strip them of their property and ban party committees at plants reflects a desire of certain political forces to banish the Belorussian Communist Party from political life in the republic and outlaw it, PRAVDA writes.

PRAVDA carries a TASS report about a meeting of the standing social-economic commission of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee.

The commission met to discuss denationalisation.

The first British woman Cosmonaut Helen Sharman will step aboard the Mir space station tonight, PRAVDA reports.

Uzbekistan, Tadzhikistan and Kirghizia signed a treaty of cooperation, PRAVDA reports.

April 2 price hikes have had little effect on Soviet producers, PRAVDA writes. Retail trade turnover in April fell by 38 per cent compared to last year's figures, it says.

The newspaper carries an interview with Luxembourg Prime Minister Jacques Santer who comments on European cooperation.

Other stories in PRAVDA cover developments in the United States, Italy, Austria, Brazil and East European countries.

21 May

LD2105061891 Moscow TASS in English 0611 GMT 21 May 91

["Soviet Press Review"—TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow May 21 TASS—President Mikhail Gorbachev met Portuguese President Mario Soares to discuss bilateral relations, today's PRAVDA reports.

The Soyuz TM-12 spacecraft carrying a Soviet-British crew docked with the Mir space station, newspapers report.

President Mikhail Gorbachev congratulated cosmonauts. TRUD and KRASNAYA ZVEZDA criticise the commercial arrangements of the mission.

Major contenders for the Russian Presidency have registered with the central electoral commission, PRAVDA reports.

The commission completed the registration of Yeltsin, Bakatin, Ryzhkov, Makashov, Tuleev, and Zhirinovsky, it says.

PRAVDA carries President Gorbachev's greetings to a scientific conference on problems facing north-eastern Asia and the Pacific.

The Soviet parliament passed a law on emigration, SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA reports, calling the move historical.

The Moscow city council refused to support the nomination of its chairman Gavriil Popov for the new post of city mayor, KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA and SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA report.

The late human rights activist and Nobel Peace Prize laureate Andrey Sakharov would have turned 70 today. PRAVDA carries an interview with U.S. scientist F. Von Hippel, who speaks about Sakharov.

RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA, KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA, and TRUD also publish articles marking the anniversary. An international congress in Sakharov's memory "Peace, Progress and Human Rights" opened in Moscow, newspapers reports.

Newspapers comment on Chinese Communist Party leader Jiang Zemin's visit to the Soviet Union. KRASNAYA ZVEZDA praises the visit's importance for bilateral relations.

SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA carries a feature about the new French Prime Minister Edith Cresson.

RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA carries an interview with U.S. Ambassador to the Soviet Union Jack Matlock, who comments on international developments and Soviet-American relations.

PRAVDA comments on German Chancellor Helmut Kohl's first official visit to the United States. Talks in Washington will show whether Bonn can again become the United States' main European partner, it says.

Economic

Filshin Appointed Deputy Foreign Trade Minister

LD2005185291 Moscow Radio Moscow World Service in English 1600 GMT 20 May 91

[Text] The former deputy prime minister of the Russian Federation, Mr. Gennadiy Filshin, who had to resign following a shady deal of 140 billion rubles with a Western company, has been appointed deputy foreign trade minister.

Mr. Filshin, who is 60, was charged with giving a go-ahead to opening a credit line in which 140 billion rubles were to be swapped for $7 billion. However, the incident seems to have failed to undermine his competence.

Fuel Oil Shortage Blamed on Waste, Misuse

PM1705154591 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 15 May 91 First Edition p 2

["Topical interview" with V. Yurov, chief of the "Rosnefteprodukt" State Concern Main Administration for Supplies, by K. Lykov; date and place of interview not stated; first paragraph is introduction: "No Gasoline Again"]

[Text] "Why is the shortage of fuel getting worse in Russia, when it is one of the areas that produces the most oil in the world?" My conversation with V. Yurov, chief of the "Rosnefteprodukt" state concern main administration for supplies, began with this question.

[Lykov] Vyacheslav Ivanovich, what is happening with fuel? Ever since sowing began, reports on the shortage of fuel are coming in from everywhere...

[Yurov] The situation is in fact very serious. Our concern, which provides fuel to consumers in Russia and other Union republics and supplies it for export, has found itself in an extremely complex situation this year. Practically all the oil refineries in the republic have refused to conclude contracts to supply the concern with the previous volume of oil products. They prefer to keep fuel themselves for barter purposes, thus making their contribution to the destruction of stable economic relationships. We appealed to the government to improve the situation umpteen times, we made umpteen decisions—all to no avail. As a result, the supply of around 5 million tonnes of gasoline and 6 million tonnes of diesel fuel is not being guaranteed to consumers on RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] territory.

Instead the cooperative workers are prospering. Cases of their offering consumers considerable quantities of fuel, up to 15,000-25,000 tonnes, but at triple the state price, are by no means isolated.

[Lykov] But as far as I know the actual oil refineries are also in a difficult position now.

[Yurov] Yes, at many plants 90 percent of the equipment is out of date. The state sold oil and oil products abroad for decades, exchanging them for consumer goods, but it did not bother to ensure that the producers had modern equipment.

Furthermore, less oil is being extracted in the country. In the first half of this year alone, 22 million tonnes of oil less than in the same period last year will be refined for the national economy. There are also many other reasons for the deteriorating situation. In particular, the railroad workers have been letting us down a great deal. Last year alone 5.5 million tonnes of oil products were not transported through their fault. In the past five years, the amount of oil products transported by rail has been reduced by 30 million tonnes. As a result, last year many oil refining enterprises were forced to work at reduced capacity or halt their production equipment altogether.

As a result of this, enough oil products to have supplied a large economic area in the country for a year were not refined.

Of course, you can understand the railroad workers too. The traffic capacity of many parts of a number of railroads has been reduced and the material-technical base of railroad transport is also behind current requirements. The only enterprise that produces railroad tank cars, "Azovmash," failed to deliver 10,000 cars in the past three years alone.

[Lykov] What is the solution?

[Yurov] The whole world found a solution a long time ago. It is oil product pipelines—the most economical and effective way of supplying fuel. But the length of the network of pipelines in our country is only 24,000 km, which is barely one-seventh of what it is in the United States. Our oil product pipelines transport around one-third of the fuel today, whereas it would already be economically viable for this proportion to be increased to three-fourths. This would demand major investments, but the expenses are recovered very quickly.

[Lykov] Are there any data on losses of fuel in the national economy?

[Yurov] Yes, they are very revealing. Take agriculture, which is feeling the fuel shortage particularly acutely. According to data from supervisory organs, up to one-fourth of the totals allocated for diesel fuel in the country's agro-industrial complex are used up for heating purposes, the preparation of fodder, heating hothouses, and other unplanned needs.

Another fact. Around 8 to 10 million tonnes of standard fuel are used up for the transportation of substandard and spoiled agricultural produce alone, which incidentally is equivalent to one-third of the total volume of consumption of oil products in U.S. agriculture.

In comparison with the United States, we use up almost double the motor fuel to ship one tonne of freight because of the low efficiency of the engines, their poor quality and unreliability, their metal content, and the poor condition of the roads. And forget the freightcars... Our Tu-154M aircraft uses up twice as much kerosene as an American airliner of the same class. Do we need to make any comment here?

[Lykov] The USSR Supreme Soviet recently adopted a resolution and the president issued several decrees concerning the material and technical supply of both the countryside and the entire national economy. So perhaps the situation on the "fuel front" will change?

[Yurov] It all depends on how these decisions are carried out. To avoid an emergency situation in providing the country with oil products, we must keep up the volume of oil supplies to refineries to the end of this year, at least at the level of the plan established for 1991. If it is impossible to do this, then immediately we will have to envision buying gasoline abroad, without waiting for the situation to deteriorate in the middle of the harvest, which is what happened last year. In addition, of course, we will have to restrict the supply of fuel to other consumers.

Central Committee Commission Views Problems

LD1705103191 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak Network in Russian 0000 GMT 17 May 91

[Text] A sitting of the CPSU Central Committee commission for agrarian policy took place on Thursday. Issues related to solving the vital problems of the functioning of the agro-industrial complex in market conditions were examined. Chernoivanov, USSR minister of agriculture and food, made a report on the state of measures for insuring price parity for the products of agriculture and of other branches of the economy. It was stressed that, as a result of the rapid rise of prices for material and technical resources and the increased costs of capital construction, the financial and economic conditions of the producers of agricultural output have sharply worsened. The speakers drew attention to the need to adopt radical measures to make up for the unjustified losses suffered by collective and state farms and other enterprises of the agrarian sphere. The issue of the policy of grain purchases in the current year was also examined.

Ministry Hosts Oil, Gas Industry Conference

PM2005132791 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 18 May 91 Second Edition p 2

[Unattributed report: "Council of Party Committee Secretaries"]

[Text] The USSR Ministry of the Petroleum and Gas Industry hosted a conference of oil and gas extraction production association party committee secretaries of a sector that has a decisive say in determining the state of affairs in the country's fuel and energy complex.

The following gave reports at the conference: B.A. Kuptsov, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee; A.G. Melnikov, secretary of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Communist Party Central Committee; L.I. Filimonov, minister of the USSR petroleum and gas industry; and P.Ya. Slezko, first deputy chairman of the RSFSR Communist Party Central Control Commission.

Group Urges Liberalization in Joint Ventures

OW2005063091 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1800 GMT 17 May 91

[From "Business Today"]

[Text] Delegates at the second conference of the Moscow Joint Ventures Association yesterday sent an open letter to the Soviet and Russian parliaments urging them to cooperate on new legislation to help increase and protect foreign investment and act against monopolies. The letter also emphasises the need to decentralise the licensing of joint venture [JV] import-export operations, lighten the restrictions on third party trade deals and reform fiscal policy.

The association, which represents some 250 enterprises, warns that if the laws on JVs are not liberalised, a significant decline in cooperation with foreign firms can be expected.

Large Natural Gas Field Discovered

LD1705131891 Moscow TASS in English 1023 GMT 17 May 91

[By TASS correspondent Vasiliy Belousov]

[Text] Murmansk May 17 TASS—A large deposit of natural gas, sufficient to satisfy Soviet and Western demands for decades, has been discovered near the city of Murmansk.

The development of the field is difficult because the Shtokmanov deposit is off the sea coast at the depth of 300 meters, prospecting experts said.

"We turned to Norwegian, Finnish and other firms with experience in designing and building facilities for deep-sea gas extraction," V. Sukhov, leading engineer of the Arktikmorneftegasrazvedka firm, told TASS.

"We've been cooperating for two years and are now completing a feasibility study for the development project. Teams from member-countries are checking each other's estimates to avoid mistakes," he said.

Western firms can count on half of the profits from the project, he said.

Meanwhile Soviet specialists have begun oil extraction in the Kolguev field. Workers are completing the construction of the first facility to service drafting drilling pads and maintenance vessels and homes for gas workers on the coast of the Kola Gulf.

Abalkin Discusses Three Stages of Economic Reform

SK2105092291 Seoul THE KOREA HERALD in English 21 May 91 p 6, 7

[Report on speech by Leonid Abalkin, director of Institute of Economics at USSR Academy of Sciences, entitled "Economic Reform: Experience and Perspectives," in Seoul on 20 May]

[Text] A high-ranking Soviet economist said yesterday that it would take some 30 years for the Soviet Union to achieve full economic reform.

"In that period our country will solve an entire complex of problems and will attain the final goal of the reform—the creation of a new economic model," said Leonid Abalkin, director of the Institute of Economics at the USSR Academy of Sciences.

The Soviet presidential aide, who arrived here Friday for an eight-day visit, made the remarks in a seminar organized by the Korea Development Institute under the title of "Economic Reform: Experience and Perspectives."

Saying there are three stages differing in timing and character of transformations, Abalkin stressed that the estimation of the perspectives of the reform is based on the prerequisite that despite all the contrariness of the processes, there won't be any social explosions or political upheavals, because though they are incapable of stopping the processes, which have started, they can seriously complicate and slow down the pace of the reform.

"The first stage, of around one and a half and two years, will be connected with measures aimed at stabilizing the economic situation, and will be accompanied by construction of the basic elements of the future market economy," the Soviet said.

At this stage we are facing the task of stabilizing the financial system and consumer market, restoring confidence in our national currency, the ruble, both inside the country and abroad, arresting decline in industrial and agricultural production, and achieving a break-through in economic dynamics, according to Abalkin.

He continued that the second phase will presumably take five to six years and envisages the completion of creation of the market economy basic structure, serious structural reconstruction, large-scale property privatization and demonopolization of production.

"It is at this very stage that we can achieve ruble convertibility. New mechanisms of economic regulation will start functioning, which will lead to initial gradual revitalization and then recovery of our national economy," he said.

But this phase won't solve all our problems either because of deep historical deformations in the economy and stereotypes in economic thinking and psychology, inherited from the past, he said.

He said economic reform in the Soviet Union is an integral part of a radical renewal of Soviet society and from the very outset was considered as a long-term strategic course rather than a single one-off action.

"Its essence lies in critical rethinking of the economic system of our country, analysis of development in the production sphere worldwide and study of the experience of countries with advanced development," he said.

Among the most important parameters of the future economic system to be shaped as the result of the reform implementation are: the creation of an economy with various forms of property, creation of modern market mechanisms, preservation of the nonmarket sector of the economy and the incorporation of the Soviet national economy in the world economy, attraction of foreign capital to the Soviet domestic market, and gradual transition to convertibility of the Soviet national currency, Abalkin said.

"The only realistic way out seems to involve simultaneous measures aimed both at getting out of the current crisis and introducing market structures and relations," he emphasized.

He continued that achievement of political stability and creation of an authoritative, efficiently functioning executive power are necessary preconditions for success.

The way to attain this lies through the signing of a new union treaty among the constituent republics, formation of a government which enjoys public confidence and has general civil consensus. This is the means to achieve radical changes without abandoning the process of further democratization, according to the Soviet economist.

Prominent Economists View Current Developments

PM1505153091 Paris BUSINESS IN THE USSR in English No. 12, May 91 pp 56-59

[Unattributed "Cover Pages: Portrait Gallery" feature]

[Excerpts] The first issue of Business in the USSR appeared a year ago. From that time on each issue carried a cover page with a portrait of an entrepreneur, economist, or state leader. One of our readers noticed a certain peculiarity: our magazine brings bad luck to its heroes. Petrakov, Shatalin, Yavlinskiy resigned, Artem Tarasov is in trouble...

There is a point in this observation. Apparently our portraits reflect the difficult situation in the USSR at present. So we asked our twelve men two questions:

1. Has anything changed in your work and life?

2. Could you comment on economic developments in the Soviet Union?

Leonid Abalkin: "I would have resigned anyway"

I am no longer a deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers. The Soviet government in its traditional form and with its traditional powers exists no more. It has been transformed into a Cabinet of Ministers.

But even without the reorganization, I would still have left my post. When I accepted it, I said that within the next 18 months the government should either change the economic situation for the better - or resign.

The period of time I set myself has passed, but the situation has only got much worse. So I do not feel I have the moral right to remain part of the government, let alone oversee reform.

I have now switched back to science and am trying to reinvigorate the activities of the National Academy of Sciences' Economics Institute, define the directions its research should take, and update its forms and methods.

How do I describe recent economic developments? As growing chaos, with the situation getting out of control as destructive trends prevail over constructive ones.

A decisive role has been played by factors outside the economy, such as political ambitions, increasing separatism, mounting passions, and the pressure of populist demands.

The government's miscalculations have also told, primarily its indecision and lack of determination in upholding and pursuing realistic economic policies. But the impact of these factors, to my mind, has been much weaker than is generally believed.

The crisis will get worse in the near future. This is unavoidable. Nothing and no one can avert it - call it fate or the inexorable logic of developments.

We have to live through this crisis in order to finally sober up, come to our senses and buckle down to work. The most important thing now is to prevent a social explosion. This is why the slogan of the day is civil peace based on the primary values - the prerogative of personal freedom, a tranquil home, and secure childhood and old age. [passage omitted]

Nikolay Petrakov: "Lip-service is paid to the market, but little is done"

I accepted the proposal to become an adviser to President Gorbachev because I hoped to help prepare decisions on the transition to a market. It is not that I am complaining. We had a good working relationship and the atmosphere was quite democratic. It seemed that the President was in favour of free discussion and calmly reacted to criticism of any views. But, by and large, it became apparent that ideas other than those oriented towards the market began to prevail. Last autumn I felt that there was no longer any need for my advice and I submitted my resignation. Now I am head of the recently-establshed Institute of Market Problems at the USSR Academy of Sciences.

We have fewer than 100 scientific workers. Our areas of research: elaboration of theoretical and methodological problems of market infrastructure (exchanges, commercial banks, etc.), analysis of the new conditions in which the non-market sector functions (social guarantees, ecology, culture) and finally integration of the Soviet domestic market into the world system.

I am afraid that the Soviet economy has yet to hit the bottom. Presumably, more severe tests are in store for it, because balances and structures that are fundamentally incompatible with the market mechanism remain. Hypertrophied basic and heavy industries, monopolism, lack of competition...Small wonder that lip-service is paid to the market but little is really being done. For example, how can one proceed with the liberalization of prices when there is no competition and the manufacturer's diktat over the consumer is retained? The domestic market should be opened up to foreign goods and capital. However, the current government seems to be opting for another course, relying on the basic sectors and the self-same military-industrial complex. Under these conditions a fresh surge of inflation is inevitable. What then? New ideological exhortations? Instead of getting down to business, will we once again, for the umpteenth time, begin to look for a guilty party, to hunt out the "enemies"?

I think there is a chance to check our slide into the abyss, but the Premier is looking the other way. [passage omitted]

Stanislav Shatalin: "Attempts to slow down reforms...must be opposed"

I understand I am expected to provide an account of the events after October 1990. At that time I was still a member of the Presidential Council and head of the economic department of the Academy of Sciences. I have now focussed entirely on my work at the Academy, for reasons that are well known. The Presidential Council has been disbanded, followed by a shake-up in the upper echelons of power. It is up to the President to decide whom he wants to have as advisers and drop them when he changes his policies. What really matters here is not somebody's career but the presidential policy. What is this policy now?

I am afraid that there has been a shift towards attempts to slow down reforms and allow the hard-liners to infringe on the gains of democracy. The trend can and must be opposed, though not with rallies and shouts of "Down with this or that!" Instead, there should be constructive work at all levels, in the republics and at the Centre, as part of an effort to encourage and consolidate the drive for private enterprise, private farming, privatization and de-monopolization. Despite enormous difficulties caused by ethnic and regional conflicts, political confrontations, distortions of the public consciousness and conservative resistance, the elements of a market economy are emerging everywhere—the grass grows through the pavement, so we must help it by enriching and watering the soil.

As for the economic sciences, we found out during the recent annual meeting of the Academy of Sciences' Economic Department that we are up to the ears in work. I'm glad to have a chance to tackle the task, although I will probably have to do other things as well. Our economic sciences must become part of the world academic process in order to be able to cope with the many issues connected with the transition to a market economy. If we don't carry out the necessary amount of academic research in all major areas, including pricing, loans, financial and monetary policies, the state and society will just continue to mark time. I still trust in the capabilities of "lonely wolves" and I think that only fainthearted people say that the voice of one man is the voice of no one. Even so, economic research institutes must develop a number of fundamental theories straight away. It's a formidable job, which can be accomplished only by well-organized and very determined groups of researchers. I will try to be involved in the work as much as I can. [passage omitted]

Grigoriy Yavlinskiy: "The Soviet economy faces stagflation"

Together with my colleagues who worked on the "500 days" programme we have set up the Inter-Republican Centre of Economic and Political Studies (EPIcentre in short). It is among the first or is even the first independent, noncommercial organization working in this field. Besides, I have become a member of the Supreme Economic Council of Kazakhstan, and there are invitations from other republics. It helps me stay well-informed on everything that is happening today, so that I can participate in drafting different bills and practical documents.

The situation in our country is becoming more and more influenced by politics. Serious economists are forced to deal with political subjects to create favourable conditions for the realization of their ideas.

Unfortunately, everything in this country, except for a few improvizations like the exchange of bank notes and the launching of financial war against the rest of the world, goes along the lines predicted by all serious Soviet and foreign economists, including the authors of the "500 days" programme.

On the one hand the situation helped raise the popularity of the programme, while on the other it greatly complicated life in the USSR. The Soviet economy now faces stagflation. The decline in production is being aggravated. The administration's rise in prices, although carried out under the slogan of reform, caused uncontrolled inflation.

It is much easier to say what has not been done during this period. The government failed to stabilize the monetary circulation, or to strengthen the role of the rouble. No official programme for coping with the crisis, and no new people in the Cabinet of Ministers of the USSR have appeared. So we can say that everything that has happened is the direct result of what has not been done. [passage omitted]

Arkadiy Volskiy: "The government must rely more on the managerial class"

I set out my views on the problems of the Soviet economy in the previous issue of the magazine. I'll add only a few words. As president of the USSR Scientific-Industrial Union I took part in a recent meeting between Mikhail Gorbachev and scientists, politicians, public leaders, government members and parliamentarians. Like others I also took the floor. Unfortunately, some important ideas are missing in the abridged report that has been published.

I said then and repeat again now that the government must rely more on the managerial class. In my view they are the main driving force in the economy, if not the only one. One should also bear in mind the changes that have taken place among workers and intellectuals. At present the country has 11 million lease-holders and six million cooperators, making up a total of 60 million if one includes their families. New laws are needed to regulate our movement towards a market-based economy. One of them—an entrepreneurship bill—was tabled by the League of Scientific and Industrial Associations together with the government, and both chambers of the Soviet parliament approved it unanimously at the first reading. After that, however, omissions started to become evident. The draft began to lose the words "private property," and "hired labour". This means that the bill was revised after approval. Who stands to gain from this?

Agricultural

Lukyanov Warns Against Agriculture 'Monopolists'

LD1805231891 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 1800 GMT 18 May 91

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Excerpts] Anatoliy Ivanovich Lukyanov, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet, today visited a number of farms in Kaluga oblast. The discussion concerned the problems of the agro-industrial complex. [passage omitted]

[Begin Lukyanov recording] I think we will find here forms of cooperation between collective and state farms and the smallholder and the leasehold collectives. All forms of agricultural production must develop. All this must be reflected in the law. The most urgent problem is to close the price gap and not allow the monopolists from agricultural machine-building, or from the fertilizer manufacturing industry, to raise prices artificially. That question is now being discussed at the Supreme Soviet session. It is being discussed in our committee. We want to restrain this problem , the problem of not allowing the prices of agricultural machinery to rise while prices of agricultural produce remain fairly stable. [end recording]

Stroyev Chairs CPSU Agrarian Commission Talks

PM1705145391 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 17 May 91 Second Edition p 2

[TASS report: "Restoring Price Parity"]

[Text] A sitting of the CPSU Central Committee Agrarian Policy Commission was held 16 May chaired by Ye.S. Stroyev, Politburo member and CPSU Central Committee secretary. There was a comprehensive examination of questions of resolving vitally important problems of the functioning of the agro-industrial complex in market conditions.

V.I. Chernoivanov, USSR minister of agriculture and food, delivered a report on the state of and measures to ensure price parity for agricultural output and that produced by other sectors of the USSR economy.

It was emphasized in particular that the rapid rise in prices for material and technical resources, the increase in the price of capital construction, and the increase in various profit taxes have caused a drastic deterioration in financial and economic conditions for agricultural producers. Fulfillment of the urgent measures to stabilize the population's food supply has been threatened with disruption.

The sitting was addressed by V.I. Shcherbakov and F.I. Senko, USSR deputy prime ministers.

The speakers noted that since the beginning of the year the economic situation in the countryside has become complex. This is largely due to the disruption of the price parity that had taken shape. Attention was drawn to the need to take radical steps to cover the losses incurred by kolkhozes, sovkhozes, and other agrarian enterprises. At the same time it was deemed necessary to formulate a mechanism that will make it possible to maintain equivalent exchange via the price system and provide compensation for additional expenditure incurred due to the rise in the cost of capital construction and production and technical output which the new purchase prices do not take into consideration.

It was also insistently demanded that the liability of officials who allow undue price inflation be enhanced.

The sitting's participants also discussed the question of grain procurement policy in 1991. M.L. Timoshishin, chairman of the USSR State Committee for Procurements of Food Resources, delivered a report.

Administrative-edict methods of getting grain into state reserves have become exhausted. The commission members advocated basing grain procurements on economic incentives for rural producers. It was recommended that grain be exchanged for mixed feed and price levers be used to increase soya, rape, pea, and sunflower procurements.

Summing up the results of the work, Ye.S. Stroyev noted the exceptionally pressing nature of the questions under consideration and the importance of urgently resolving them to provide political and socioeconomic support for the peasantry and labor collectives engaged in agro-industrial production. Restoring pricing parity is far from just a mechanical task. It is a highly important area of the party's agrarian policy today.

Visits Stavropol, Meets Boldyrev

914B0157B Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian 16 May 91 p 2

[Report by TASS correspondent N. Styazhkin: "The Countryside Needs Help"]

[Text] Stavropol, 15 May—Stimulation of the Communists in the practical implementation locally of the decisions of the CPSU Central Committee April (1991) Plenum and the urgent measures pertaining to realization of the agrarian reform was the subject of the discussion at meetings of rural workers of Stavropol with Ye.S. Stroyev, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, during his 5-day tour of the area from 11 through 15 May.

He visited kolkhozes and sovkhozes in the majority of climatic zones of the area, talked with the people who work in the processing industry, with construction workers, and poultry breeders of the Stavropolskoye public enterprise for broiler meat production, addressed a meeting of activists of the CPSU's kray organization and met with the participants in an out-of-town meeting held in the Niva Stavropolya Science-Production Association of the All-Union V.I. Lenin Academy of Agricultural Sciences Presidium on problems in modeling processes in regional agro-industrial complexes.

It was emphasized in the discussions that there is no realistic way to overcome the food shortages other than the emancipation of initiative and enterprise based on the multistructural nature of production relations, the equality of the various forms of management and a strengthening of the state service of material and technical provision of the agrarian sector.

The Stavropol region is a major granary providing the non-Chernozem area, the Baltic, the Urals, and Siberia with wheat of enhanced baking properties. A further increase in the production of particularly high-grade food grain is, as before, a most urgent problem. But, nothing ventured, nothing gained. And for the purpose of emancipating the tenant grain grower, the co-op member, and the tenant farmer, the Stavropol people are implementing fundamental structural transformations within the kolkhozes and sovkhozes.

Corn, pea, and what is particularly promising, soybean sowings, are being expanded in the kray to improve feed production and enhance the efficiency of stock breeding. The party Central Committee will contribute to these initiatives in every possible way, Ye.S. Stroyev told your correspondent, summing up the results of the tour.

I.S. Boldyrev, chairman of the Stavropol Kray Soviet of People's Deputies and first secretary of the CPSU kray committee, toured the kray with the CPSU Central Committee secretary.

Agriculture Minister Discusses Spring Field Work

LD1505092291 Moscow Central Television Vostok Program and Orbita Networks in Russian 1530 GMT 15 May 91

[From the "Vremya" nescast]

[Excerpts] Our correspondent has talked to Vyacheslav Ivanovich Chernoivanov, the recently appointed USSR minister of agriculture and food, about the progress of spring field work throughout the country. [video shows correspondent interviewing minister]

[Begin recording] [Correspondent V. Golubev] Vyachelsav Ivanovich, how is the end of the first sowing?

[Chernoivanov] I would say that the difficulty is that over 20 million hectares more than last year have to be plowed. Our sowing shortfall of winter crops amounts to something like 4 million hectares. The sowing area as regards the main grain crops, and as regards the main crops apart from potatoes, about which it is still too early to speak, is at virtually the same level as last year.

[Golubev] How large an area is sown to cereals?

[Chernoivanov] We need to carry out our spring sowing over an area of 144 million hectares. Today we have sown something like 60 million hectares. If we are to say whether that is a lot or a little, it is slightly lower than last year's level. At the same time, during last week, the pace of sowing increased significantly. Admittedly, the weather is not helping this everywhere. Negative processes have already emerged, taking place in the northern oblasts of Kazakhstan and in Siberia, where there will not be enough moisture. On the other hand, in a whole series of regions we have a greater quantity of moisture than is necessary, which is holding up all the spring field work.

[Golubev] That is where the Kuban fits in, where a state of emergency has been declared.

[Chernoivanov] I will explain why that was done. In the Kuban, after examining the state of affairs, and bearing in mind the weather conditions, a decision was made to mobilize all resources, reserves, and forces to carry out within a fairly short time all the work that has to be done. [passage omitted]

This year the weather is shaping up in such a way, compared to last year, that a large amount of grain can be expected. Last year, we remember, the harvest was a disaster for the country. We hardly gathered at all what we could have gathered. What wealth was allowed to slip through our fingers!

[Golubev] Vyacheslav Ivanovich, the country's leadership, President Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, the Cabinet of Ministers, and Valentin Sergeyevich Pavlov have taken measures in good time and published the relevant documents at the government level on virtually all the matters that were not resolved promptly last year. A great deal of work must now be carried out in the localities. It is necessary to bring up to snuff all the drying equipment, if we talk about grain. It is necessary to do the same to grain threshing floors. The experience of previous years, and that is recorded in our normative documents in the current year, shows that various industrial organizations must actively help in the work. That is not yet happening today. [passage omitted] [end recording]

Notes Various Problems

LD1505100191 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 1850 GMT 14 May 91

["Topical interview" with USSR Agriculture Minister Vyacheslav Ivanovich Chernoivanov by correspondent V. Golubev; date and place of interview not given—recorded]

[Excerpts] [passage omitted] [Golubev] There are very many complaints among the peasants that the fleet of tractors and machines is very worn out.

[Chernoivanov] I would single out not machines and mechanisms and not the preparations of agricultural equipment itself, but, first and foremost, plant protection agents are reaching us with great delay. Even though the government took measures in good time and allocated the necessary resources for the purchase abroad of herbicides, pesticides, and other plant protection agents, their delivery was held up considerably. Today and in the future this is the main difficulty we need to surmount.

I would also note questions that have not been resolved today. This is regarding the provision of fuel and lubricants. In the first place, this concerns aviation fuel. Deliveries are far below what they should be. Slow deliveries are already adversely affecting the entire spring field campaign. This also applies to the provision of material and technical resources, machines, equipment, and spare parts. By spring it is too late to be speaking about spare parts for machines and equipment. As regards herbicides, fertilizers, and the provision of fuel and lubricants, that is still relevant. I will take advantage of this opportunity to call on the collectives—the Minneftekhimprom ministry and the Agrokhim association—because this is our joint cause. What we sow is what we will reap, and that is how we will live.

[Golubev] [passage omitted] This year we already have our hand out. We are looking for credits in order to purchase grain abroad. Is that how it will turn out this year?

[Chernoivanov] Documents have been adopted at the Union level, but work must be organized further—work that must carried out in the regions and work that must be carried out in the collectives that supply the machines, equipment, fuel, lubricants, and various other materials needed by agriculture. Work is already being completed to conclude contracts among enterprises and collective and state farms and various leasehold collectives to enlist the services of manual and office workers and students for gathering the harvest. Last year we had a negative experience when we talked for a very long time. In the final analysis, a large quantity of the harvest remained unharvested. [passage omitted] Of course, no one will come to us in the Union and repair threshing floors or crop dryers, or duly prepare all the implements necessary for the preservation of grain.

[Golubev] In regard to storage capacity, we frequently are simply unable to transport grain to the state silos.

[Chernoivanov] The issue of enlisting the services of trucks belonging to the military departments has been resolved. However, the following problem arises: In the course of four months we have received some 19,000 trucks less than we should have. We are enlisting the services of the military for gathering the harvest while at the same time our industrial associations like the Ministry of Automotive and Agricultural Machine-Building, Kamaz, and other associations are not supplying the quantity the countryside should have received. [passage omitted]

[Golubev] The solution of the probelems has been linked with the development of agrarian reform. In your view, how is the agrarian reform in the country developing?

[Chernoivanov] The process is in progress. In various republics it is proceeding differently. In some republics it is proceeding more intensively, while in other republics it is proceeding less intensively. Some 3 to 4 million hectares of land have already been handed over for the development of smallholdings. Much land has been handed over for the development of horticulture. Private plots at farms have been expanded. We only need to help bring about the implementation of the agricultural reform at a pace that is sufficient for the current state of affairs in our country's agrarian sector.

[Golubev] We are speaking of the freedom of the smallholders, but for some reason whenever it is a question of the freedom of the farm, we are not in a hurry to give it its freedom. What is your point of view on this matter? Will you give freedom to collective and state farms?

[Chernoivanov] I think that the system of the transition to the market will undoubtedly lead us to the fact that he who produces agricultural produce must be the proprietor of this produce and must dispose of it at his own discretion. That is the very freedom that peasants have acutally already been trying to achieve for a long time. In the final analysis, the ownership of property, of land, is not the main prerequisite; the main thing is that a peasant who has a harvest or agriculture produce can freely dispose of it.

[Golubev] I wish you success. I thank you for this conversation. I think that we will meet again quite a few times.

RSFSR Commission on Party Role in Reform

914B0157A Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian 14 May 91 p 2

[Unattributed report: "Commission Meeting"]

[Text] A meeting of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Communist Party Central Committee Commission for Agrarian Policy and Ties to the Peasant Movement, which was conducted by V.I.

Kashin, Politburo member and Central Committee secretary, has been held. It studied the main directions of the strategy and tactics of the Communist Party's agrarian policy under modern conditions and also the practice of the interaction of party committees and soviet and economic bodies in mobilization of kolkhoz and sovkhoz outfits for the purchase of grain and other agricultural products for state resources.

The participants in the meeting observed that the principal directions of agrarian policy are radical economic transformations in the agro-industrial complex and its retooling and the social reorganization of the countryside. The Communist Party puts at the center of its political work defense of the interests of the peasant and active struggle to establish him as the true master on the land. It supports in every possible way a diversity of forms of ownership and affirmation of the peasants' right to tenure of the land and choice of method of management on a voluntary basis and will contribute to the assurance of full independence and equal economic conditions for the kolkhozes and sovkhozes, the peasant and private farms and tenant outfits.

It was proposed to ensure the interaction of party, soviet, and economic authorities locally and perform the requisite organizing and political work in all outfits of the agro-industrial complex in order to comply with the tax in kind and the government contract for the procurement of grain and other agricultural products for state resources in the amounts established by the government for 1991.

Problems in Potato-Growing Sector Reported

PM2005132591 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 15 May 91 Second Edition p 1

[Correspondent N. Kireyev report under "Yesterday, Today, Tomorrow" rubric: "I'm Sure We All Respect the Potato. Who Is To Blame and What Is To Be Done"]

[Excerpts] Tula-Kaluga-Ryazan—Even in the central oblasts of Russia, which have long been renowned for their crumbly and cheap potatoes, prices have rocketed to 3 rubles [R]. Last year's wet weather is not the reason. Or rather, not the sole reason...

Let us recall, who "flooded" the city with the large, even tubers? The private producers with their small allotments. Without a surplus and having left a substantial reserve stock in the cellars for themselves and the animals, and for seed. Enough for all. But now there are no potatoes in the stores, not even enough for planting. Where have they all gone? Perhaps the consumer cooperative system snapped them all up?

"No," V. Marochkin, chairman of the Board of the Tula Oblast Potrebsoyuz [Union of Consumer Trade Cooperatives], objected. "Whereas in 1986, for example, we bought 65,000 tonnes of tubers from the private grower and 18,000 tonnes from the kolkhozes, last year procurement offices bought just 26,000 tonnes of the 'second crop after grain.' One-third of that figure came from private plots."

Many farms in Tula Oblast have currently laid in one-half of the required amount of seeds. Some have been left without seed stock of their own at all. Potato purchases in Kaluga Oblast have fallen considerably. There has been a fourfold reduction in the Ryazan region. The seed situation is also dire. Yet this is a potato region. Have they changed trades?

"Nothing seems to have changed," agro-industrial committee specialists reply. "As for private truck farms, the Ryazan peasant used to plant 30,000 hectares with potatoes and is sticking to that area. Admittedly, the crop has declined. The situation in the kolkhoz and state sector is no better."

People are blaming all the misfortunes on poor-quality strains, Colorado beetle, phytophthora, nematodes, and other diseases. Undoubtedly, they are doing the plantations great harm. What is the main cause here? Potato growers do not have the proper incentives, and the equipment situation is bad.

The private growers on their allotments—and they are the main supplier of the second crop after grain—churn out potato after potato. They are not wild about crop rotation: apples here, strawberries there... As a result the soil is not left to lie fallow or cleared of diseases. [passage omitted]

Meanwhile, potatoes are becoming more expensive than bread. It may even be necessary to resort to exotic foreign produce.

Rostov Harvester Builders Hit by Shortages

PM2005131991 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 1800 GMT 16 May 91

[From the "Vremya" newscast: Report by N. Chebotarev and V. Yablokov from Rostov's Rosselmash plant—recorded]

[Text] [Announcer] Grain is already ripening in the south of the country, and again, just as last year, an alarming question is arising: Will we manage to harvest it?

[Chebotarev] The alarm is very justified. If Rosselmash grinds to a halt, the fate of the harvest is in jeopardy.

[Yu.A. Peskov, general director] As you know, this will be the 30th harvest in my time at the Rosselmash. I could never have foreseen the current situation at the plant ever happening in my lifetime.

The situation at the moment is this. The shortfall in harvesters now totals 10,000 and is approaching 10,500. Krasnoyarsk accounts for 3,500 harvesters, and Tula for the rest, including 3,000 Don combine harvesters. I cannot claim that the Tula or the Krasnoyarsk plant is to blame. They too are at a complete standstill, just like the Rosselmash plant.

[Chebotarev] There is no rolled metal, no pig iron, operations at the foundry are being suspended, components are lacking. Take these machines—and there are already several thousand of them—they are standing in the plant yard with components missing. Meanwhile they should already be on their way to the fields. It is possible, of course, to blame this on the general chaos and to say that the Rosselmash is not the only plant experiencing difficulties. But let us separate the essential from the inessential. It is possible to get by for a while without jeans or padded jackets, but if the grain is left unharvested in the fields...

[Peskov] In my opinion, unless problems pertaining to the supply of rolled metal and components to the Rosselmash, Tula, and Krasnoyarsk plants are resolved literally within hours—days will not do because the harvest itself is starting in 40 days—this year's harvest will be disrupted.

Progress, Problems in Spring Sowing Reported

LD2005112891 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak Network in Russian 0600 GMT 20 May 91

[Text] Here is how things are unfolding in the country's fields. By the beginning of the last third of May, only just over half of the spring crop area has been sowed. Is this a lot or not? I want to say that we might wish it was more but, generally speaking, even this tempo allows the workers on the land to fulfill targets on time. If this cannot be achieved by the optimum deadlines, then at least within a reasonable time.

Over 2 million hectares daily have been brought under various agricultural cultures recently. Most work is being carried out in the Russian non-Chernozem zone in the grain and potato fields, in the Volga region and, of course, in Kazakhstan and beyond the Urals where the bulk of the spring crops are located.

As usual, these are very uneven conditions for sowing: The spring floods brought considerable changes to agricultural work in the [word indistinct] Volga region. Tens of thousands of hectares of land in the flood plains of the Volga River and its tributaries were under water for a considerable length of time. In some places in the east, the beginning of spring somehow promised sufficient moisture in the soil, but winds quickly dried the earth. So, time limits on works being carried out on the land is especially important now.

That was a short report about sowing. But the second half of May in the south is a time for looking after the cultivated crops, which were sowed first thing in the spring. I mean sunflower, cotton, sugar beets, and corn, and this means millions and millions of hectares. Haymaking has also begun in the south. Perennial grasses, first of all lucerne, are ready for the first hay harvest in some farms of Central Asia. We usually receive the first reports on grain harvester combines entering the fields in the valleys of Central Asia by 20 May, but this year early spring grains are maturing a bit later than usual. By the way, early maturation is not necessarily a sign of a good harvest.

If we look at the entire picture of spring work—I discussed this with specialists—then despite difficulties, some of which are objective, there is a basis for some optimism. The winter crops survived the winter rather well. On the whole there is quite a good reserve of moisture in the soil. The main thing, however, is that work is being carried out despite political cataclysms and despite all our shortages of the basic necessities for a normal life and work.

There is another thing to mention. For the first time, the number of farm holdings in the country equals the number of state and collective farms. There are about 50,000 such holdings. Yet they do not have much land—on average, 20 hectares for a farm building.

Agricultural Developments for 9-15 May Reported

LD1605054991

[Editorial Report] The following is a compilation of reports on agricultural developments in the USSR between 9 and 15 May. Source and time of broadcast, given in GMT, are in parentheses at the end of each item.

9 May—Collective and state farms in Pavlodar Oblast have sown spring crops on 2.26 million hectares. (Alma-Ata Domestic Service in Kazakh, 0200)

10 May—Collective and state farms in Altay have started sowing sunflower for grain. The valuable oil-yielding crop will occupy about 150,000 hectares, which is more than last year. Mainly seeds of the high-yielding Yenisey variety have been prepared. (Moscow All-Union Radio First Program Radio-1 Network in Russian, 0900)

Scientific

Soyuz Spacecraft Docks With Mir Complex

LD2005233191 Moscow TASS in English 1430 GMT 20 May 91

[By TASS Correspondent Rena Kuznetsova]

[Text] Moscow May 20 TASS—The spaceship Soyuz TM-12 has just docked with the Soviet orbital complex Mir.

The spaceship is manned by a Soviet-British crew—Soviet cosmonauts Anatoliy Artsebarskiy and Sergey Krikalev, and British research Cosmonaut Helen Sharman—who were launched on May 18.

The eighth main expedition, Viktor Afanasyev and Musa Manarov, have been aboard the Mir orbital complex for the sixth month now.

Gorbachev Speaks With Cosmonauts

LD2005210191 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak Network in Russian 1830 GMT 20 May 91

[Conversation between USSR President Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev; USSR cosmonauts Viktor Mikhaylovich Afanasyev, Musakhi Romanovich Manarov, Anatoliy Pavlovich Artsebarskiy, Sergey Konstantinovich Krikalev; and UK "cosmonaut researcher" Helen Sharman on 20 May; Gorbachev is in Moscow, speaking to the cosmonauts as they orbit Earth on the Mir space station; cosmonauts are not identified as they speak—recorded]

[Text] [Cosmonaut] Mikhail Sergeyevich, good evening.

[Gorbachev] Good evening.

[Cosmonaut] The crew of the Mir orbital complex welcomes you.

[Gorbachev] I am sincerely glad for this meeting and this great event. I would like to express joy and admiration at what you are doing. This is great work, and it is natural that it is within the competence of courageous people and modern and educated people. I would like to express admiration that today you, the two crews, acted together very skillfully in difficult conditions and showed endurance, and you were not nervous. I must say that we know here that Helen Sharman also acted well, so she fitted into the team well, as I see it. In sum, I congratulate you.

[All cosmonauts] Thank you.

[Gorbachev] What are you doing now?

[Cosmonaut] We are getting ready for supper.

[Gorbachev] Ooooh! [laughs] If we had linked up a little later, we could probably have joined you, so to speak.

[Cosmonaut] We can wait, Mikhail Sergeyevich.

[Gorbachev] How do you feel, Viktor Mikhailovich and Musakhi Romanovich?

[Cosmonaut] Fine. The crew who have arrived are also fine.

[Cosmonaut] Even better than fine. We are glad the replacements have come.

[Gorbachev, laughing] Well, I congratulate you. I know that you have a special climate there. There must be a basis of friendship, complete compatibility, and devotion to each other and this great work. It cannot be otherwise. How about Helen? Can I speak with her?

[Sharman] Good evening. I can say that the two days I was in the ship with Anatoliy and Sergey, they worked very well. The work was very difficult, especially at the beginning, when weightlessness begins to work. They worked very well, and they helped me very much.

[Gorbachev] Well, I am glad to hear that your voice is good, strong, and happy.

[Sharman, laughing] Very happy. [Gorbachev laughs] We have two other friends here: Musa and Viktor. They are very happy and pleasant.

[Gorbachev] I congratulate you on this meeting, and this event in your life, and this great event for our two peoples.

[Sharman] Thank you. Of course, a great deal of work has already been done because we have been preparing for the flight. It is not only starting now. Nevertheless, I also hope that this will help the friendship between our countries.

[Gorbachev] Very good. In recent years, we have, indeed, continually been getting closer together, expanding our cooperation. Your flight with our cosmonauts is a symbol of this cooperation. I congratulate both you and our cosmonauts, and in your person, our peoples as well.

[Sharman] Thank you.

[Gorbachev] Helen, the comrades here, my colleagues, have told me that during the flight, during the initial stage, you displayed a great deal of self-control and will, and this was a matter of great joy for them. They say that you had to show a great deal of skill, knowledge, and self-control regarding the docking, too, and that, in this case, too, Helen worked along harmoniously. You're a fine girl, as we say, and I congratulate you on that!

[Sharman] Thank you.

[Gorbachev] Viktor Mikhailovich, Musakhi Romanovich, Anatoliy Pavlovich, Sergey Konstantinovich, and, finally, our guest—well, not only a guest but a full member of the crew—I wish you a successful flight, successful fulfillment of the program. To those who will remain in orbit, I wish success and good fortune in your work and well-being. To those who will return, I also hope that everything goes well. We will be waiting for you!

[Manarov] Many thanks. Hearty wishes for good health and all the very best!

[Gorbachev] Will you be having a first-rate dinner?

[Manarov] Why, of course, we certainly will.

[Gorbachev] Goodbye! All the best!

[All cosmonauts] Goodbye! All the best!

Sees Boost in UK-USSR Cooperation

LD2005180191 Moscow TASS in English 1731 GMT 20 May 91

[Text] Moscow May 20 TASS—It was announced here today that the Soyuz TM-12 spaceship docked to the Mir space station today, May 20, at 17:31.

The Soviet-British crew consisting of Viktor Afanasyev, Musa Manarov, Anatoliy Artsebarskiy, Sergey Krikalev and Helen Sharman began to implement their work programme, says a telegram sent by commander of the mixed crew Viktor Afanasyev to President Mikhail Gorbachev.

Their work programme includes scientific, technical and medico- biological experiments.

In a reply telegram, the president cordially congratulated the Soviet-British crew on the start of the joint work aboard the Mir complex.

"Your flight graphically shows a chance to raise friendship and cooperation between our countries to higher levels," Gorbachev's telegram says. The president wished the cosmonauts the successful implementation of the flight programme and happy return to Earth.

Afanasyev thanked the president for warm greetings and good wishes.

Modified Shuttle Starts Ground Tests at Baykonur

PM1705115791 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 1800 GMT 15 May 91

[Report by A. Gerasimov, P. Orlov, and V. Pankratov from Baykonur; from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Announcer] The new Buran-2 reusable spacecraft has been moved from the assembly and test hall to the Baykonur launchpad.

[Unidentified voice] This craft will dock with the Mir station, and the Buran crew will board it in orbit. For the time being, the reusable spacecraft is ready for ground tests only.

On the morning when the Buran was being wheeled on a mockup carrier rocket toward the launch pad, the crews of the upcoming Soviet-British space expedition were receiving their Soyuz TM-12 craft in the neighboring assembly and test hall and packing a shipment to themselves—the Progress cargo craft.

Judging by appearances, the sight of the resuable spacecraft on the launchpad made a profound impression, on the British cosmonauts in particular. For our cosmonauts it spells a different kind of future. But the next two space expeditions—Artsebarskiy and Krikalev, and after them their backup crew of Volkov and Kaleri—will not be working on the Buran. They are undergoing training for normal Soyuz launches.

On the eve of the launch both crews were given the go-ahead by medics for the upcoming flight. For the Soviet cosmonauts this means eight extra-vehicular activities and five months of work in orbit.

According to what we were told, however, funds for the space program are guaranteed only for the next quarter. Right now we are having to choose between fundamental and applied experiments. The number of astrophysical observations on the current expedition has been substantially cut back.

It is hoped that next year, which has been declared Space Year, this craft will carry a Mir crew.

Space Agency Congress Outlines 1992 Agenda

LD1805081491 Moscow TASS in English 2032 GMT 17 May 91

[By TASS correspondent Rena Kuznetsova]

[Text] Moscow May 17 TASS—The world scientific community plans to give special emphasis to global ecology in every event of the international year of space which will be marked in 1992, Interkosmos Council Chairman Vladimir Kotelnikov told a news conference here today. The news conference was devoted to the results of the fourth session of the congress of space agencies devoted to the international year of space.

The Soviet Union plans to launch in 1992 an ecological module to dock with the Mir orbital station. The module will carry equipment devised by researchers from different countries, Kotelnikov said.

The Soviet researcher told the news conference that a total of 13 major projects will be carried out to study such global phenomena as the polar stratospheric ozone and the monitoring of the polar ice shield.

He noted that during the international year of space, which coincides with the 500th anniversary of discovery of America and the 35th anniversary of the launch of the first artificial earth satellite, the space agency around the world will seek to demonstrate the possibilities for the use of global research, the results of which were obtained from space.

The news conference was addressed by the leaders of organisations and departments dealing with the holding of the international year of space in Japan, Germany and the National Aero-Space Agency of the United States.

Serial Shows Previously Classified Space Archives

LD1905093691 Moscow TASS in English 0909 GMT 19 May 91

[by TASS correspondent Oleg Serdobolskiy]

[Text] Leningrad May 19 TASS—British lady cosmonaut Helen Sharman, who is now circling the earth on board the Soyuz TM-12 spaceship, will be a character in a documentary entitled "The Strength of the Weaker Sex". The picture is dedicated to the world's all "space ladies", beginning from Valentina Tereshkova and other women cosmonauts who were also prepared for a space flight.

The documentary is part of the "Man in Space" new serial, two parts of which have already been shown in Leningrad.

The new production by the Neva film studio (the Lenfilm Association) abounds in unique materials that were classified only recently, including hitherto unknown-to-the-public episodes of space tests and lift-offs, unsuccessful booster launches, and space walks.

There is also footage about a would-have-been cosmonaut Georgiy Nelyubov, who together with Yuriy Gagarin and Gherman Titov was preparing for the first-ever space flight but was expelled from the cosmonauts' unit for a disciplinary misdemeanour. "Upon the advent of glasnost, we have managed to fling the door open to the secret archives of the Soviet Defence Ministry's Energia Association and show space endeavours unknown to cinema audiences," Yevgeniy Mezentsev, producer of the serial, told TASS.

He wrote the script together with Yaroslav Golovanov who had studied the space theme for many years.

The serial in the genre of philosophical essay will be crowned with the picture "Rendezvous Over the Planet" for the 15th anniversary of the Soyuz-Apollo test project.

Military

Yazov Issues Orders on Armed Forces Reduction

LD2005125191 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 1229 GMT 20 May 91

[Text] The Russian News Agency reports that USSR Defense Minister Dmitriy Yazov has issued a verbal instruction that, when numbers of personnel in military units are being cut back, the first reductions in force should be of officers and warrant officers who have left the CPSU. That was a Russian News Agency report, citing circles close to the Ministry of Defense.

All-Army Party Bureau Endorses Ryzhkov

PM1705122191 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 17 May 91 First Edition p 1

[Unattributed report: "Came Out in Support"]

[Text] The All-Army Party Committee Bureau of the USSR Armed Forces CPSU Organization has discussed the question of the participation of Army and Navy party organizations in the election of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] president.

The Bureau came out in support of the decisions of the military and labor collectives which have nominated Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov as a candidate for the RSFSR presidency. In this connection the party committees of military units, combined units, and establishments located on RSFSR territory have been recommended to organize active propaganda of the candidate's election program among voters and to assist voters action groups and the candidate's fiduciaries in agitating for him.

The All-Army Party Committee Bureau urges all Army and Navy Communists, servicemen, workers, employees, and members of their families to support Ryzhkov's candidacy.

Army Aide on Candidate for RSFSR Presidency

PM1605144791 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 16 May 91 First Edition p 1

[Colonel N. Bolshakov report: "Preparing for Elections"]

[Text] A 14 May meeting of chiefs of military-political organs and leaders of working groups examined the progress made in preparing for the election of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] president.

Reports were heard from Comrades Ye. Kropachev, V. Smirnov, V. Gnezdilov, and A. Makunin regarding the state of organizational and agitation-propaganda work. It was noted that the fact that the forthcoming presidential election is to be contested necessitates well-conceived tactics. Each contender—and there are plenty of them—will be fighting for each voter. It is important—as Colonel General A. Ovchinnikov, first deputy chief of the USSR Armed Forces Main Military-Political Directorate, stressed at the conclusion of the conference—to support the candidate whose position as regards the unity of our state and Armed Forces and our socialist choice is notable for its consistency and firmness.

Shchit Claim of Anti-Yeltsin Crusade Rebutted

PM2105103791 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 18 May 91 First Edition p 2

[Captain 2d Rank M. Lukanin report: "It Is Spring and the Emissaries Have Arrived"]

[Text] Petropavlovsk-Kamchatskiy—Barely had the citizens' impressions of their recent meetings with the "legendary democrat" T. Gdlyan had time to wear off than RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] People's Deputy and "Shchit" [Shield] Chairman V. Urazhtsev arrived here. And he immediately expressed the conviction that people are not being allowed to write the truth about him and his activities in KRASNAYA ZVEZDA.

Well then, let us restrict ourselves to bare facts, as they say.

At a session of the oblast soviet presidium, Vitaliy Georgiyevich [Urazhtsev] announced that his appearance in Kamchatka was connected with what they are saying about 50 or 60 generals dispersing through the Army in order to agitate against the election of B. Yeltsin as president of the Russian Federation. And by announcing this, it has to be said, he caused much surprise among among local deputies.

"We do not have any agitators of this sort, let alone at the rank of general," was the comment on this piece of "news" I drew from Captain 2d Rank O. Zhamangarinov, member of the oblast soviet presidium and chairman of the committee for the affairs of servicemen and their families. "For good or ill, generally speaking there is currently no preelection agitation being carried out in units and on ships. All previous elections, including the referendum, showed that servicemen are absolutely free to express their will. To suspect them of anything else is even somewhat disrespectful. Incidentally, there has never been a case in which the voting results in military election precincts have differed sharply from the civilian population results."

As we can see, Urazhtsev's use of the generals as a scare tactic was all in vain. Rather he took the role of emissary on himself in this instance. Well, people are free to do as they please. So after this you can believe the claim that "Shchit" is a nonpolitical organization that pursues servicemen's exclusively social interests.

Military Lessons of Gulf War Analyzed

PM1705160191 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 17 May 91 First Edition p 2

[Interview with Lieutenant General S. Bogdanov, chief of the USSR Armed Forces General Staff Operational-Strategic Research Center, by observer Lieutenant Colonel A. Dokuchayev under the "View from the General Staff" rubric; date, place not given; first paragraph is KRASNAYA ZVEZDA introduction: "Lessons of 'Desert Storm'"]

[Text] KRASNAYA ZVEZDA published a series of articles analyzing the combat operations in the Persian Gulf region. This topic continues to trouble our readers. Questions of interest to them are answered in conversation with our observer by Lieutenant General S. Bogdanov, chief of the USSR Armed Forces General Staff Operational-Strategic Research Center.

[Dokuchayev] Sergey Alekseyevich, readers inquire: What were the chief features and trends manifested in the sides' armed struggle?

[Bogdanov] In terms of the forces involved, the war in the Persian Gulf region proved to be the largest-scale local conflict since 1945. In my view two factors had a decisive influence on its outcome. The first was the fact that by using disinformation measures the leadership of the multinational force achieved operational-tactical surprise in carrying out the offensive air operation and during its very first days paralyzed the Iraqi troop and weapon control system. The second factor was the passiveness and indecision of the top Iraqi leadership and the poor training of command personnel. This was why the strikes were practically of a one-sided nature.

To make profound conclusions and define the new trends manifested in the sides' armed struggle it is necessary to study other factors both on the political, diplomatic, and economic plane and on the purely military plane, the positive aspects, and the mistakes made by the opposing forces. This is a very complex task. The problems will be examined in detail at an upcoming Defense Ministry scientific and practical conference.

It is already possible, however, to conclude that intensive combat operations were conducted in all three media with the massive use of modern combat means, including those with a promising future, under conditions of intensive electronic countermeasures against enemy troop and weapon control systems. The command of the multinational force gambled on surprise, the force of an air and missile first strike, and quantitative and technological superiority. The success of the operation, as well as the war as a whole, was made dependent on the outcome of the struggle to achieve superiority in the air, in other words on the results of the air operation.

I must mention the following. Making use of the results of the war in the Persian Gulf, the U.S. leadership began to venture, as THE WASHINGTON POST for 13 March this year emphasizes, to "talk loudly about a 'unipolar' world in which there is no doubt about the influence of the United States, because this country's strength is without equal."

[Dokuchayev] Some specialists point out that the war in the Gulf was the first of the so-called star wars. What effect did the use of new kinds of arms have on the results of the fighting?

[Bogdanov] I will remind you that what U.S. specialists understand by the term "star wars" is the large-scale use of means of armed struggle in space and from space. And by calling the conflict in the Persian Gulf the first war of the "space era" representatives of the U.S. armed forces command are evidently seeking to emphasize the importance of the use of space means in that war and their weighty contribution to enhancing the effectiveness of combat operations by aircraft and ground groupings of the multinational force.

Reconnaissance from space really was the main means of obtaining information on the position and condition of Iraqi troops. The extensive use of space communications and navigation systems ensured the steady control of the troop groupings of the multinational force—which, of course, promoted success.

Only it must be remembered that, because Iraq did not have the necessary countermeasures, the U.S. space means functioned in the conflict under testbed conditions, as it were. Nonetheless, the experience of the use of space means in that war is of definite interest to us.

[Dokuchayev] Today the political result of the war is known to everyone. The Iraqi Armed Forces quit Kuwait. But the military result... There is still contradictory information here. Representatives of the U.S. command reported right after the end of combat operations that the multinational force had knocked out all 42 Iraqi divisions involved in the fighting and 4,000 out of 4,280 tanks. There were reports that the multinational force captured approximately 175,000 Iraqi servicemen and destroyed 2,000 of the 3,000 artillery pieces in Iraq's arsenal and 2,000 out of 2,700 armored personnel carriers. The Iraqi side maintains something different. It says that there was no flight from Kuwait but an organized departure. Despite the enemy's superiority many times over, it succeeded in preserving the army, a large number of aircraft and armored vehicles... What is your assessment of the outcome of the fighting?

[Bogdanov] It seems to me that the U.S. information on the combat losses of Iraq's armed forces was significantly overstated. Therefore it is evidently necessary to speak very cautiously of any specific figures for Iraqi losses. It has to be admitted, however, that in the course of the air and missile strikes the multinational force succeeded in not only inflicting considerable losses on Iraq's army but also having a strong psychological impact on its personnel. At the concluding stage of the war, during its ground phase, first-echelon Iraqi divisions offered practically no resistance to the attacking troops. But this does not mean that all the Iraqi combined units lost their combat ability. Those same U.S. sources have disseminated this information: Troops loyal to S. Husayn are showing high combat readiness in combat operations against the rebel Kurds and Shiites.

I will repeat myself: It is necessary to speak very cautiously of the Iraqi troops' combat losses. With time military experts and analysts will reveal the real picture of the fighting in the region—which will make it possible to assess the sides' losses and the art of warfare more objectively.

[Dokuchayev] Various branches of armed forces and categories of troops participated in the war on both sides. The Americans, in particular, gambled on aircraft. Incidentally, our commanders suffer from a shortage of aircraft when planning and organizing mock battle during command-staff and operational-tactical exercises. Have military specialists changed their views on the correlation of the use of various branches of armed forces and categories of troops?

[Bogdanov] The apparent trends in modern armed struggle really do predetermine to a certain degree the priority of aircraft as the most maneuverable and long-range means of struggle. But this does not mean that the need for the other branches of armed forces has fallen away.

The war in the Gulf graphically showed that the conceptual thesis of the ground forces' determining role in achieving the ultimate goals retains its validity today. This is borne out by the data on their groupings by the start of operation Desert Storm. The sides' ground forces totaled more than 1 million men, up to 80 divisions and 90 separate brigades, approximately 10,500 tanks, and more than 12,000 guns and mortars. The most important conclusion from the Persian Gulf crisis is evidently that every modern local conflict or war in a separate theater of military operations will be prosecuted using nonstandard methods and new forms of using armed forces. And, at the same time, within the framework of military operations the proportion of the contribution of the various branches of the armed forces to defeating the enemy will depend each time on the specific military-political aims of the war, the conditions of the situation, and the designs behind the sides' actions. It is necessary to proceed from the premise that modern war is a war of intellects at all levels of leadership and execution, of "intellectual" means of armed struggle.

According to the foreign information that we have, it may be assumed that the efforts of the military leadership in the United States and in the other countries whose armed forces participated directly in the conflict will be aimed at further developing aviation equipment in keeping with Stealth technology, providing aircraft with promising, highly accurate weapons systems, and developing transport and army aircraft.

[Dokuchayev] Both professional servicemen and those drafted into the army participated in the war. How superior were the former in terms of combat skill? Was the war not an argument in favor of the concept advanced by those who campaign for our Army to be placed on a professional basis without delay?

[Bogdanov] In all the world's armies professional servicemen now constitute the basis of air and missile units. The combat operations showed that the professional training of the U.S. troops' pilots and missilemen proved considerably better than the Iraqis'.

As regards the ground phase of the fighting involving ground groupings, among which not only professionals but also reservists operated on the U.S. side, while soldiers drafted on the basis of compulsory military service operated on the Iraqi side, it is very difficult to draw unequivocal conclusions in favor of one method of manning or the other. Under conditions of disrupted control and the psychological impact of incessant air and missile strikes and artillery fire by the multinational force, the commanders of Iraqi units and combined units failed to show initiative and avoided organizing resistance to the attacking troops of the multinational force. I believe that the results of that war do not contain any convincing arguments in favor of our Army's full switch to professional manning. Incidentally, many prominent military specialists from the countries of the anti-Iraq coalition spoke out during the war in favor of the mixed principle of manning armed forces.

[Dokuchayev] Both sides used hardware created in the United States, France, Italy, Britain, the USSR, and other countries. Whose armament stood the test more successfully? Incidentally, as a result of the war the Americans have made super publicity for their weapons...

[Bogdanov] The multinational force used weapons and military hardware developed using the latest technology in the world's leading countries. Modern arms made up no more than 10 to 15 percent of Iraq's army. The rest, including Soviet arms, were one or two generations behind modern arms. Then, under conditions of disrupted troop and weapon control and the strong psychological impact on personnel, the Iraqi arms and hardware were hardly used during combat operations. And it is hard to say anything concrete about their combat potential.

As is known, the United States and its allies in the anti-Iraq coalition used the very latest models, including experimental ones, of weapons and military hardware during the conflict, which will constitute the basis of their combat might in the immediate future. It is natural that, under conditions where the Iraqi Armed Forces offered no active resistance, the effectiveness was mainly quite high. But their use can only be regarded as proving-ground tests. The mass media of Western countries, particularly the United States, are doing all they can to publicize the advantages of their own weapons and military hardware for the purpose of ousting Soviet-made arms from the world market. It is known from foreign information that during the preparations for and the conduct of the combat operations in the Persian Gulf there were problems both in operating and in using U.S. combat hardware. These were occasioned not only by the special features of the Near Eastern theater of war, but also by design faults in a number of models. But the Americans do not speak openly about this.

[Dokuchayev] Of course, our General Staff attentively followed the development of combat operations in the Gulf. What conclusions are military specialists drawing for themselves?

[Bogdanov] The General Staff is continuing its careful analysis of the combat operations by the multinational force and the Iraqi army. I am convinced that after completing in-depth studies of the results of that war the leadership of the Ministry of Defense and the General Staff will take everything useful into account for the development of the USSR Armed Forces.

Nothing particular, however, has been noted in the views of the U.S. armed forces command on the methods of preparing for and waging war (combat operations). The troops and staffs operated mainly according to the well-known and customary scenarios which they have dashed off in the process of operational measures and according to the provisions of U.S. and NATO guiding documents.

The results of the war in the Persian Gulf will not have a negative effect on the USSR's position with regard to reducing the Armed Forces and arms. Nor are there any serious grounds for any significant corrections to the concept of military reform. At the same time the U.S. approaches to resolving regional conflicts and also internal problems in other countries by exerting strong-arm pressure or openly using armed forces against them on the pretext of defending U.S. vital interests oblige us in the future to take a more considered attitude to reducing our Armed Forces and arms.

Baltic Republics

Estonia's Savisaar on Foreign Economic Links

LD2005142891 Tallinn Radio Tallinn Network in Estonian 0800 GMT 18 May 91

[Interview with Estonian Prime Minister Edgar Savisaar by correspondent Kaja Karner, place and date not given—live or recorded]

[Excerpts] [Karner] How would you characterize our foreign economic realtions presently?

[Savisaar] Well, of course, foreign economic relations are related to the level of our political independence. [passage omitted] On the whole, foreign economy is also the sphere where most attempts are being made at hindrance—as much as possible—by Moscow, along our independence path. Namely, in this area the policy of force is being applied most, in order to protect the centralized economy as it has developed over time. For us that means that our western border is still jointly the USSR customs border, where not Estonian but USSR customs laws are valid. [passage omitted]

It would be incorrect to demand or to expect that we already be recognized as a separate state, but we are already being considered an independent partner in economic relations. This is a political dilemma for us. There a number of states and firms ready to conclude direct relations with us, but should they then conclude these ties with the Estonian Soviet Socialist Republic it would mean an official recognition of the annexation of Estonia, both from their and our point of view; that is why a certain political ambiguity is characteristic of our foreign economic links. We are being recognized and supported as a nation aspiring to freedom, but one cannot as yet talk of Estonia as an independent state. We can but talk of certain elements of statehood; of their reemergence. That way our economic relations for the most part are not so much agreement concluded at the state level as those between firms.

But of course, one can also talk of aid programs targeted at Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania as a whole. For example, our most extensive cooperation is with Sweden, whose government has allocated 150 million Swedish kroner over three years for eastern Europe, including the Baltics. The money is earmarked for education and environmental protection first and foremost, as well as for developing technology. Next, the Finnish Government has allocated 236 million Finnish marks over the two years for environmental programs in eastern and central Europe, and that includes also some Estonian ones. The Danish Government has promised 300 million Danish kroner for eastern Europe, including Estonia. [passage omitted]

As a politician I could perhaps ask if capitalism is the best economic system; it has shortcomings of its own, and indeed inhumane aspects of a kind also exist in it. But the world has simply not dreamed up anything better. But what is certain is that the socialist economic model is finished; it simply burned itself out, and that is that. Now we are on a path toward capitalism. Capitalism presupposes money, and money means the currency—or hard currency—that is accepted in world banks. We have to attract it. [passage omitted]

Altogether, what is meant by selling out? Previously we had only been giving Estonia away; or we relinquished it, or gave up treating it as our own, as has in fact happened in the case of Narva, and while we are giving Estonia away piecemeal nobody was making any noises. [passage omitted]

Poor and miserable we are, indeed; we cannot hide the fact. But we must not be stupid. If we cannot see any benefit in a Western entrepreneur coming here with his modern machinery, with his working practices and relationships, then we are simply stupid. If we only sell raw materials, underprocessed goods, or minerals in fear of selling Estonia away, then we are also stupid. [passage omitted]

Latvian-Soviet Talks 'Postponed' Until June

LD2005132791 Moscow TASS in English 1312 GMT 20 May 91

[By TASS correspondent Galina Kuchina]

[Text] Riga May 20 TASS—The second round of talks between the delegations of Latvia and the USSR, scheduled for May 23, was postponed until early June, the press service of the Latvian Government announced.

"The Soviet side is unprepared for them," the press service quoted Ilmar Bisher, first deputy prime minister and head of the Latvian delegation, as saying.

Soviet Comments on Delay

LD2005153891 Moscow TASS in English 1506 GMT 20 May 91

[Text] Moscow May 20 TASS—Valentin Ogarok, member of the Soviet delegation at talks with Latvia and deputy chairman of the USSR State Planning Committee, told TASS in a telephone interview that Vladimir Velichko, head of the Soviet delegation and first deputy prime minister, was preoccupied with "urgent state matters," in particular he needs to leave on "an urgent business trip."

According to Ogarok, the possibility of postponement, on agreement of the sides, is envisaged in the protocol on talks, signed by the two sides.

Lithuania Proposes Economic Accord With Moscow

LD2005134791 Vilnius Radio Vilnius in Lithuanian 1300 GMT 20 May 91

[Text] Lithuanian Prime Minister Gediminas Vagnorious has sent telegrams to USSR President Mikhail Gorbachev, and USSR Prime Minister Vitaliy Doguzhiyev, which states:

The Government of the Republic of Lithuania is generally in support of the actions taken by the USSR Cabinet of Ministers with regard to the program to overcome the economic crisis and its principal statutes.

We intend to participate in the work of the program's implementation. First, in order to normalize economic relations and to enhance economic activity by preparing and signing an appropriate bilateral agreement between the USSR Government and the Lithuanian Government.

Should your decision be affirmative, the Government of the Republic of Lithuania is prepared to immediately begin drafting such an agreement.

Belorussian-Lithuanian Border Incidents Reported

Casualties Cited

PM2005194491 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 21 May 91 Union Edition p 2

["Direct Line" report by Nikolay Lashkevich from Vilnius: "Lithuania: Casualties on the Border With Belorussia"]

[Text] Incidents at Lithuanian border and customs posts, mainly on the border with Belorussia, have led to tragic results.

On Saturday afternoon at a border checkpoint in Shalchininkskiy Rayon not far from the Belorussian border, an inhabitant of the neighboring republic was killed. According to unofficial sources, the dead man was a precinct militiaman from the small Belorussian city of Benyakoni. The official findings on the circumstances surrounding the incident will become known later.

Republic Prime Minister G. Vagnorius has sent a telegram to the Belorussian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Government and MVD [Ministry of Internal Affairs]. It offers condolences to the relatives and friends of the dead man and proposes setting up a joint governmental commission. Unfortunately, this tragic finale to the "war" between Lithuanian customs and border checkpoint personnel and OMON [special purpose militia detachment] groups which have been periodically attacking the checkpoints and customs posts, and individual inhabitants of Shalchininkskiy Rayon was only to be expected. A week ago there were clashes in the same rayon between the OMON and staffers of the Lithuanian border protection services. A few days ago a customs post in Varena came under fire, the chief of the customs post duty shift was wounded, and a bus stop was set on fire. On Saturday night there was an attack on the Kalvarija border checkpoint. According to the official authorities, the checkpoint was set on fire and people on duty there suffered injuries.

The situation in Lithuania has again deteriorated sharply. V. Landsbergis, who returned to Lithuania Saturday after a two-week tour of the United States and Germany, spoke at the second conference of the consultative council of political parties and movements, where he delivered a statement on the "wave of terror" in Lithuania. "New tests lie in store for Lithuania. It will have to live in very difficult conditions, but we will stand firm," he said. Representatives of the Lithuanian Communist Party, speaking via the television station which was seized 13 January, claim that the Lithuanian leadership is deliberately whipping up the atmosphere and inciting people to armed confrontation.

As you can see, the center of confrontation between political forces in Lithuania has this time shifted to the borders, where it transpires that both sides have accumulated a good many weapons. And a rifle that hangs on the wall overlooking the political stage has a habit of shooting.

Sunday night brought another casualty. At the border checkpoint in Krakunai, duty shift chief Gintaras Zigunas was shot dead. At a press conference on Sunday V. Landsbergis expressed regret over the incident and accused the central authorities of destabilizing the situation and provoking conflicts. He linked the tragic incidents on the border with the actions of Soviet troops and OMON subunits. V. Landsbergis called on the republic's inhabitants to be calm.

A group of Belorussian MVD staffers is coming to Lithuania to join the investigation of Saturday's incident. It only remains to hope that this week, which promises to be politically eventful, will not be so tragic, and that the opposing political forces will at last show prudence.

Lithuanian, Belorussian Premiers Comment

LD2005144591 Vilnius Radio Vilnius Network in Lithuanian 1300 GMT 20 May 91

[Text] The government press bureau has reported that this morning Gediminas Vagnorius, prime minister of the Republic of Lithuania, held a telephone discusison with Vyacheslav Kebich, prime minister of Belorussia, in which they talked about the situation which has arisen on the border between Lithuania and Belorussia, near some of the customs posts.

It was emphasized in the telephone conversation that everything should be done to protect good bilateral relations, so that the path towards any conflicts whatsoever would be blocked.

It must not be allowed for customs issues to become the cause of interstate conflicts.

Agreement was alao reached in the conversation on a joint bilateral investigative commission that would investigate the incidents speedily and objectively.

Belorussian Prime Minister Kebich and Lithuanian Prime Minister Vagnorious have expressed their hope that such incidents will not supply a basis for interstate disagreements.

No Decline in Relations Cited

LD2005135891 Vilnius Radio Vilnius Network in Lithuanian 1400 GMT 20 May 91

[Interview With Lithuanian Prime Minister Gediminas Vagnorius by Guoda Salciute by telephone—live]

[Excerpt] [Passage omitted] [Salciute] Esteemed prime minister, today you held a telephone conversation with Kebich, chairman of the Belorussian Council of Ministers. Apparently the conversation concerned the most recent incidents along the Belorussian border.

[Vagnorius] Yes, I am pleased to note that these incidents do not exert any influence to cause a worsening of relations between the Lithuanian Republic and the Belorussian Republic. It was ascertained that everything must be done to preserve good bilateral relations. They are imperative to block any conflicts. The prime minister and I agree that this should not act as the start of some type of interstate conflict. We agree [words indistinct] they will participate in a joint investigation group.

[Salciute] In brief, it is possible to observe that a provocation between two neighboring republics was not successful this time.

[Vagnorius] Looking at it from a state level, I think it really did fail.

I would like to say a few words about the [word indistinct] meeting that is slated for [words indistinct]. It is most interesting that neither the aim of this meeting nor its demands are clear to us. I had the opportunity to read the paper signed by the Farmers' Union. Unfortunately, no definite aims have been formulated. One gets the impression that it is of a political nature. However, its aims remain unchanged.

The issue is not the very fact of the meeting—concern is raised because this week, these days, many other various activities also happen to be taking place, even political activities. The Soviet Union is planning a military action. There are maneuvers perhaps serving as a preparation to separate by means of military force Vilnius Rayon—the Salcininkai Rayon—from Lithuania and perhaps from Belorussia. I do not know what the plans include, but such a move is being readied, as are [words indistinct] of the deputies. What is disquieting is the fact that similar activities are being planned in Estonia and Latvia, appears to me that in January things were similar, when at one time many actions did coincide. They appeared unconnected, but it turns out they had been planned, especially since similar actions are taking place in Estonia and Lithuania [words indistinct] not to give in.

I think that these people who perhaps may participate in such meetings perhaps are not even aware of all this—perhaps even certain organizers are not aware of all this. Especially the organizers must be aware of they must know what they are seeking and who controls them. We invite the people of Lithuania not to give in to deceit. More than ever, harmony is necessary. Questions must be solved in offices. I hope for more patience.

In closing, I would like to direct my remarks to farmers, first of all to the average farmers. The government, even during these especially difficult days, when the crisis is touching [word indistinct] branches, is giving agriculture more attention than ever. [passage indistinct] I think the farmers will understand this. [passage indistinct]

Buildings Burned

LD2005194891 Vilnius Radio Vilnius Network in Lithuanian 0900 GMT 20 May 91

[Excerpt] [Passage omitted] The Supreme Council press representative, Audius Azubalis, presented some facts concerning new attacks on the Lithuanian-Belorussian border: Last night on the Vilnius to [Name indistinct] road, at the border post where on 19 May border defense staff member Gintaras Zagunis was shot, two small buildings were burned to the ground. A small trailer was also burned at the border post located near the Eisikskiai to Raudone road.

The Belorussian internal affairs services are willingly assisting in the investigation surrounding the Lithuanian border defense member's death circumstances and in searching for the criminals. [passage omitted]

Custom Checkpoints Burned

OW2105015691 Moscow BALTFAX in English 1000 GMT 20 May 91

[Text] Lithuanian radio has reported two Lithuanian custom chekpoints were burnt down in the Salcininkai district at the Belorussian border on sunday night. There were no casualties because Lithuania had recalled all of its custom officials after the May 18-19 events in that district see BF [BALTFAX] news bulletins for May 18-19 reporting Saturday's murder of a Belorussian police officer on the Vilnius-Lida highway near the Belorussian border.

BF's correspondent, quoting sources said to be close to the Lithuanian government, reports that the Belorussian policeman was shot and killed by a Lithuanian borderguard defending his life. The policeman is said to have stormed into the borderguard station to terrorize the local servicemen and fire shots from his pistol. According to the Lithuanian government's press service, he was wearing civilian clothes.

According to the press service of the Soviet Interior Ministry, however, the policeman was returning from Lithuanian to Belorussia as his car came under in the vicinity of the border station.

The government of Lithuania met on Saturday to set up a commission to investigate the incident. The commission, with Lithuanian Vice Premier Zigmas Vaisvila at its head, is expected to make public its findings to later that Thursday.

Gintaras Zhigunis, chief of a borderguard post near the town of Krakunai at the Lithuanian-Belorussian border, was shot and killed from a hunter's rifle on Saturday night after all the other borderguards had left the post to avoid conflicts in the wake of the Belorussian policeman's murder earlier that day. Zhigunis, 34, was married with two children.

The Lithuanian government's press service reported on Sunday that the deaths of the Belorussian policeman and Lithuanian borderguard were being investigated jointly by the Interior Ministries of the two republics.

The Belorussian side says three suspected killers of Zhigunis have been detained.

The head of Lithuania's Supreme Council, Vytautas Landsbergis, speaking to a news conference on Sunday, accused the Soviet Army and OMON (special purpose militia detatchment) of atempts "to provoke the authorities in Lithuania to take retaliatory measures and thus create a pretext for the army to step in, enabling the Kremlin to launch yet another propagandistic campaign."

Vilnius Personnel Not To Take Part in Air Strike

OW2005045491 Moscow BALTFAX in English 1500 GMT 18 May 91

[Text] The air dispatchers and pilots of the Vilnius airport will not take part in the national pilot and air dispatcher strikes on May 21.

It has become known that the National Trade Union of Air Dispatchers sent a cable to Soviet Civil Aviation Minister B. Panyukov that demands a 300 percent pay raise, a 36-hour work week, the extension of paid leave to 45 days and the deduction of part of the hard currency earned from international air traffic to the pay fund.

On Thursday a sitting of the Vilnius airport staff most of whom are not ethnic Lithuanians decided not to walk out; it agreed, however, on a telegram to the Soviet government supporting the demands of the strikers.

Lithuanian Interior Minister Interviewed

LD1805131891 Vilnius Radio Vilnius International Service in Lithuanian 2100 GMT 17 May 91

[Text] Minister of Internal Affairs Marijonas Misiukonis, in an interview with the weekly newspaper MAZOJI LIETUVA, stated that the political juncture is knocking already at the Interior Ministry's door. [sentence has heard]

As an example he cited the unnamed six individuals in Kaunas who had decided that the the candidacy of the city's police commissar, suggested by the ministry, was inappropriate, and it was not even presented for deliberation before the city council.

We think, observed the minister, that this is a result of the policy of the independent party and other organizations' activity.

In the opinion of Marijonas Misiukonis: Today we are distancing ourselves from principles of a law-based state. According to him, extreme forces sometimes seek blood to justify their political ambitions.

Last fall this minister had to withstand public accusations in the parliament when, among other things, he had been accused of cooperating with the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs and the Defense Ministry in rounding up escaped soldiers.

Has at least one soldier been captured with our assistance asks Marijonas Misiukonis in the weekly newspaper MAZOJI LIETUVA? He notes that possibly due to cooperation ties and contacts with Moscow, last year Lithuania was not the scene of what is now taking place in many of the republics. According to him a police split today would be a most terrible thing and an unforgivable error.

As previously reported, the Lithuanian and the USSR Minister of Internal Affairs signed an inter-relation protocol with each other at the end of April in which the independence of the Lithuanian Ministry of Internal Affairs and its police law were acknowledged.

Among other things, Marijonas Misiukonis points out in the interview that it would have been the gravest error if the policemen were located near the television tower and the Television and Radio Cener on 13 January had weapons in their possession, and he considers armed resistance as inexpedient in general.

Lithuania 'Agitated' at Rising Prices

LD1705085491 Vilnius Radio Vilnius in Lithuanian 2030 GMT 15 May 91

["At Bedtime" talk by announcer Lyubov Chernaya]

[Excerpts] We all are very agitated by the introduction from 15 May of commercial prices for some non-food goods that are in great demand. Many shops in Vilnius are closed today; some of them are not selling all goods, as re-pricing is taking place. So far it is rather difficult to understand at what prices these goods will be sold because the variety is great. But it is known that the Silelis and Tauras television sets and Snaige-117 refrigerators will cost 4,000 rubles [R] each; black and white Silelis television sets, R800; clothes irons, up to R120; Soviet-made sewing machines, about R1,800; and the Veritas machines, almost twice as much. Prices of furniture vary, although they will be increased by roughly 1.5 times. [passage omitted]

It is already obvious today that these prices will not last long. Probably, they will be changed in two to three weeks' time. Everything will depend on demand. Goods which will continue to be in demand will become more expensive, and those which will be unsold will be repriced. Prices will be regulated by the market which is our republic is gradually entering.

From 15 May, depending on demand, prices of some imported goods will also change, such as footwear, clothes, and others. For exmaple, men's winter shoes and sports footwear will be cheaper, but the prices of women's footwear will almost double.

Prices of goods produced in Lithuania will depend on the prices of raw materials.

Thus the market, awaited for us for so long, has arrived. It is not difficult to forecast that prices will rise and they will be roughly the same as at the Gariunai market or as those published in private advertisements in the newspapers. This was to be expected. The only interesting question is whether all these goods will freely appear in the shops. The compensations of R85 or R105 which we are receiving today will of course not enable us to purchase these goods freely. Without doubt, we will have to tighten our belts. What can we do? Market is market. Will we be able to work harder in order to earn more? Because with the present taxes introduced in our republic, there is no stimulus to work better.

RSFSR

Congress of People's Deputies Opens 21 May

LD2105072191

[Editorial Report] Moscow Russian Television Network in Russian at 0655 GMT begins a live relay of the Fourth Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic, RSFSR, Congress of People's Deputies from the Kremlin in Moscow.

At 0702 GMT Yeltsin, accompanied on a platform by Khasbulatov, Goryacheva, and an unidentified person, welcomes the deputies to the congress and asks the deputies to register—1,004 deputies registered for the congress. The number of deputies present today is 918. A quorum is announced and the congress is declared open.

Yeltsin begins speaking at 0706 GMT. He says the main question to be discussed is the preparations for the RSFSR presidential elections, and he recaps the work done so far by the RSFSR Government.

He says that over the past year, Russia has begun to deal with its own economy, and he recaps on the laws and other changes which are being implemented, including in foreign policy, and the mass media.

"The situation is developing in other republics. Yes, the center has begun to realize that and to go over from confrontation to cooperation, and this was reflected in the statement of 23 April—of the Nine plus One, as it is called," Yeltsin says. He adds:

"The main thing is that a good basis has been laid for practical transformations and dynamic movement ahead. This is all the more necessary since the real conditions of life for the Russian people have not improved recently but have gotent worse. The Russian leadership has actively protested against the desire of the center to transfer the weight of the way out of the crisis upon the shoulders of the people. It has been possible only to slightly alleviate the social consequences of the measures of the Union leadership for the people."

Yeltsin says that major decisions still remain on paper to a significant extent and are not always fulfilled, and not just because the laws of Russia are deliberately ignored and because there is overt and covert sabotage. He says the local authorities often lack the competence to carry out the decisions. Unless measures are taken to enhance the efficiency of executive power we might not get out of the crisis, Yeltsin says.

"The presidency is not an aim in itself. But the election of the president is not an isolated ritual act. It is a major step toward raising the efficiency of power and of strengthening the statehood of Russia," Yeltsin says.

"But that is not the most important thing. Russia needs a president and the presidential system to ensure that the laws and programs which have been elaborated are implemented," Yeltsin says, and then speaks of the preparations for this congress.

"Some candidates for the post of president have already registered," Yeltsin says. "I call upon you, esteemed deputies, to evaluate the depth of the arguments of the candidates, of their political positions and plans, not to give into spur-of-the moment emotions and to the logic of blind political struggle." He says that the tribune is one of political pluralism. He says that every candidate has the right to convince the electorate of the rightness of his views.

Yeltsin then says that the congress opens on a notable day—the 70th anniversary of the birth of Andrey Dmitriyevich Sakharov. He praises Sakharov. "Andrey Dmitriyevich was right because he has, he had, the secret grasp of the truth, and it was revealed to him perhaps more often than others. today, Andrey Dmitdriyevich belongs to immortality. We are trying to travel the same path which that man traveled. If he had been alongside, there probably would have been less zig-zags, losses, and confusion. But it has become particularly clear now that there is at least one fateful error which we can and must avoid. That is stopping confusion. But it has become particularly clear now that there is at least one fateful error which we can and must avoid. That is stopping, refusing to move ahead along the path of reforms, to the aims which he proclaimed—peace, progress, and human rights. I believe that we will succeed in preventing such a mistake which would have tragic consequences," Yeltsin says to deputies' applause.

At 0720 GMT, following Yeltsin's speech, Plotnikov speaks on membership of the secretariat.

At 0721 GMT Novikov submits a proposal for an extra member of the secretariat.

At 0722 GMT Yeltsin proposes a vote on the secretariat. The vote is taken and passed. The secretariat is asked to occupy the front five rows and to start work.

At 0725 GMT Yeltsin invites comments on the agenda. A delegate speaks on the agenda.

Yeltsin says his remarks were long-winded and unclear.

At 0731 GMT Deputy Konovalov makes procedural suggestions from floor, followed by Deputies Plotnikov and Starkov, who says the Russian legislature's position on the Armenian-Azerbaijan issue is immoral, given Yeltsin's praise for Sakharov earlier. This is commented on by Deputies Kulakovskiy, Peruanskiy, Berestovoy, Mazarov, Shelboldayev, an Udmurt delegate, Kaziy, and Nunuyev.

At 0749 GMT Kibirev speaks about civil harmony and the Union treaty; he wants Yeltsin to report on progress in drawing up the treaty. Yeltsin replies to him, doubting the need for this.

Next, several deputies speak briefly on the agenda.

At 0803 GMT Sheynis opposes expansion of the agenda. He says urgent matters should be dealt with first, and wants the "intolerable" Nagorno-Karabakh situation discussed. He praises Sakharov, who visited the region despite ill health and emphasizes that the genocide of Armenian people must stop. All the dead must be honored, he concludes.

During endorsement of the congress agenda, a proposal comes from the floor that the situation between Azerbaijan and Armenia should be discussed and that the RSFSR should state its position, given Yeltsin's earlier praise for Sakharov's moral stand on such issues. Yeltsin proposes that it should be included under any other business. An initial vote on the proposal fails to win a sufficient majority. After 10 minutes of exchanges and procedural votes a second vote is taken which produces a result of 476 in favor to 132 against. The subject is therefore to be included under any other business.

Next, Yeltsin asks all to stand in silence for a minute in tribute to all who have died in the Transcaucasia conflict.

At 0826 GMT Orlovskiy speaks on presidential candidates. Yeltsin explains a point.

At 0827 GMT Shakhray discusses the procedure for appointing a constitutional court and judges.

At 0831 GMT a vote is taken on whether to postpone the appointment of judges until the next congress. It is not passed. Several speakers discuss whether the agenda should be expanded. A delegate says the procedure is being violated, which Yeltsin denies. As the discussion continues, Zadomskiy requests discussion of the miners' strike. Yeltsin points out the agenda has been decided and asks deputies not to shout.

Federal and Union treaties have been discussed at previous sessions, Yeltsin says; a vote is taken on whether to incluide a report on this under other business and is passed. Khasbulatov will present the report. The work of the Supreme Soviet and confirmation of laws passed by the Supreme Soviet can't be included, Yeltsin says.

Further discussion follows on expanding the agenda.

At 0852 GMT, speaking of Russian television broadcasting of the congress, Yeltsin says:

"With respect to television, we have Russian Television now. There are six hours every day. Therefore, in the course of six hours, we, of course, can broadcast material from here. At least, preliminary consultations with our Russian Television company and with the committee show that they will broadcast three times in the course of the day, directly at the sitting, then a report and then, so to speak, also directly again in the evening, and so forth. Maybe we will thus instruct our glasnost commission together with our television company, its leadership, to examine every day what should be broadcast on television. We will trust them. We won't dictate every half hour, every hour, what should be broadcast or what should not be broadcast. Do you agree? [indistinct calls from hall]

"Well, what do you mean about our television, are you censors? Do you, nevertheless, insist upon broadcasting everything? Well, taking account of the fact that the proposal has been made to broadcast in full, I will put the question to the vote." There is excitement in the hall as deputies call out to be given the chance to speak. Yeltsin calls the deputy at microphone number four to speak.

Deputy Oleg Maksimovich Poptsov, chairman of the all-Russia State Television and Radio Broadcasting Company, introduces himself and says: "Well, I think that it would be sensible to vote on every occasion, if we see that one sitting of the congress or another requires to be broadcast in full. We can vote for that calmly. But, I do not think there is any sense in having that as a dogma, nor is it sensible. We should define our position separately every time. I think that if we have a two-hour diary, that is practically one-eighth, even more than one-eighth of the work of the congress on the air, that is quite enough to get a picture of what is happening at the congress. If we add to this that apart from that a congress diary is switched on from the congress three times, for 15 minutes each time, it seems to me that the congress is represented voluminously and sensibly. When the situation demands and when it seems to us that we should broadcast in full we can vote for that. It should not be forgotten that equipment quotas are being removed from the Russian company, the all-Russian company, on account of the congress. That means that, apart from the congress, we are stripping our channel as such as a whole. I ask you simply to take that into account. But a decision should be taken separately every time."

Yeltsin then reminds deputies what Poptsov is proposing: "It is proposed that at the end of every sitting the question of that day be decided as to whether it be broadcast in full or not. Well, will we broadcast all our discussions on the agenda, then? I understand the constructive proposal on the examination itself of questions, yes. The deputies are insisting. I put it to the vote that today be broadcast in full. I ask you to vote. I ask you to express your opinion by voting."

Yeltsin then tells deputies that no more proposals on the agenda are being accepted so there is no point in their standing at the microphones. Deputies call from the hall and Yeltsin says: "I ask you not to bother the presidium."

Following the vote, the computer voting panel shows 228 votes for, 547 against, with a sign saying "not adopted." Yeltsin says: "The decision has not been adopted. So, Oleg Maksimovich, act according to your timetable. I am addressing People's Deputy Poptsov, together with our glasnost commission."

Next, a vote on a proposal by Piruanskiy to deal with other business at the beginning of each day instead of the end is not passed.

Yeltsin clarifies the procedure and says the congress must end by Saturday.

Yeltsin Gives Opening Remarks

LD2105084291 Moscow Russian Television Network in Russian 0706 GMT 21 May 91

[Opening speech by Boris Yeltsin, chairman of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic, RSFSR, Supreme Soviet, at Fourth RSFSR Congress of People's Deputies in the Grand Kremlin Palace in Moscow—live]

[Text] Esteemed people's deputies! The fourth congress is starting its work. The main question to be discussed is the preparation for the election of the Russian Federation president. The work needed to be done by the Supreme Soviet in accordance with the behest of the Third Congress of People's Deputies has been carried out. Laws have been prepared on the president, on the election of the president, as has an RSFSR law on alterations and supplements to the Constitution of the RSFSR. These are being submitted to the congress.

The presidium of the Supreme Soviet has adopted a decision on the organization and holding of elections. The electoral campaign is already under way. It is becoming more intense and voters are joining in. This has been shown at least by the way in which signatures for the presidential candidates were collected.

We can see in practice that the will of the people, expressed in the referendum, reflected not a fleeting mood but the civic position of the people of the RSFSR. Our duty as deputies is to carry out their legitimate decisions, all the more so since the need for a presidential form of rule has become obvious.

For a year the Russian bodies of power have been moving in the direction determined by the decisions of the First Congress of People's Deputies. In practice we started from nothing and were objectively placed in a situation of doing the most complex work, work which was in some degree thankless and not always noticeable. For in essence neither the Supreme Soviet of the Russian Federation, nor the Council of Ministers were what they should have been, and now they are working they have their own character and are transforming their prestige in the country.

The building of Russian statehood has started. The potential for direct cooperation with the other republics, including cooperation on a multilateral basis, has been built up. A draft constitution for the Russian Federation directed toward the future has been worked out and approaches to a reform of its national territorial structure are being clarified.

Further, Russia had hardly anything to do with its own economy, in essence it didn't have one, because nearly everything belonged to Union departments. Serious change has started in the situation over the past year. Russian initiatives in the economy have become an important factor in the life of the whole Union. Very important laws which form the legal foundation of market relations have been passed or are at the stage of being passed. A very important law on land, has been passed. Land reform has begun, and real conditions have been created for it to be speeded up. Some quite good decisions have been adopted and are starting to take effect in the social sphere—the law on pensions, the decision to cut the working week, the increase in minimum vacations, measures for social protection of citizens against price rises, and a number of others.

The Russian Federation has for decades had virtually no part in foreign policy, has not had any noticeable independent contacts with other countries, and in this respect has even been lagging behind other republics. Now we are starting to take on this sphere as well. Russian mass media have been formed and are operating. But it is not only in Russia that changes are in progress.

The situation is changing, developing in other republics. Yes, the center has begun to realize this and to go over from confrontation to cooperation, and this was reflected in the statement of 23 April, of the Nine plus One, as it is called. The idea of a resolute switch to the market has ceased to cause an allergic reaction from the Union leadership. And this is not caused just by life itself, but is also the result of the efforts of all supporters of radical reforms, including Russian deputies.

Albeit with great difficulty, the need for a new Union, a union of sovereign states, is gaining in understanding. The year has not been wasted, and quite a lot has been done in the context of consolidating reformist forces in the country and in Russia. But, of course, we could do even more. The main thing is that a good basis has been laid for practical transformations and dynamic movement ahead. This is all the more necessary since the real conditions of life for the Russian people have not improved recently but have gotten worse. The Russian leadership has actively protested against the desire of the center to transfer the weight of the way out of the crisis upon the shoulders of the people. It has been possible only to slightly alleviate the social consequences of the measures of the Union leadership for the people. This is clear evidence that we in the republic still do not hold the real levers of ecoomic power.

Major decisions still remain on paper to a significant extent and are not always fulfilled, and not just because the laws of Russia are deliberately ignored and because there is overt and covert sabotage. Often, the bodies of power in the localities simply cannot carry them out, they lack the powers. And, in many cases, that happens because they are condemned to inefficient work by the character of the structure of Soviet power. That worries us deeply. After all, unless work is begun today to raise the effectivness of power, especially of executive power, we could obstruct economic reform, too, and fail to achieve improvements in introducing order on the streets of Russian cities. In other words, we will not get out of the crisis.

For a long time we ignored world political experience, relying, first of all, upon ourselves, upon those who stood at the sources of the Soviet state. Today, we must become more open in that respect.

The presidency is not an aim in itself. But the election of the president is not an isolated ritual act. It is a major step toward raising the efficiency of power and of strengthening the statehood of Russia. Further, steps ensue to strengthen all the vertical lines of executive power, with the direct election of leaders. These questions are now being elaborated and consultations are being carried out with the local bodies of power, including through the Council of the Federation of the RSFSR, and specialists are being involved in this question.

But that is not the most important thing. Russia needs a president and the presidential system to ensure that the laws and programs which have been elaborated are implemented to embody in a practical and material way the results of the work of the legislature of the congresses of People's Deputies of the Russian Federation.

The preparations for the present congress, unlike the previous one, proceeded in a calm and businesslike atmosphere. April and May were intensive months, perhaps more intensive than ever before, and most importantly, they yielded the results of the deputies work. The mood of constructive cooperation of various deputies' groups gained the upper hand over confrontation. I think that at this congress, too, we could work fruitfully and dynamically.

Some candidates for the post of president have already registered. As for other congresses, we are still to find our position and thereby directly participate in the electoral campaign. I am sure that the deputies will approach that question with the maximum responsibility and will take a statesmanlike and human approach to it.

I call upon you, esteemed deputies, to evaluate the depths of the arguments of the candidates, of their political positions and plans, not to give into spur of the moment emotions and to the logic of blind political struggle.

The Congress rostrum is the rostrum of political pluralism, the rostrum of a variety of ideas. Let's proceed from this rule, established by the deputies themselves as early as our first Congress of People's Deputies. Every contender has the right to try to persuade the voters of the rightness of his views, aims, and program. I believe that we at the congress could set a constructive, dynamic, human tone for the whole election campaign. This is all the more necessary since our voters for the first time will have to make such a responsible decision as the choice of a president of the Russian Federation. I voice my hopes that deputies understand the importance of all this, and will act accordingly at the congress.

Esteemed people's deputies! The fourth congress is starting its work on a significant date; today sees the 70th anniversary of the birth of Andrey Dmitriyevich Sakharov, a great thinker and man, a citizen of Russian and of the world. We have yet to grasp the scope of his genius and vision, to realize the profundity of the ideas which he left as a legacy for us who go on living. During his life, he was frequently the subject of harsh criticism and of condemnation, and he was insulted and slandered even more often, but he stayed unbroken. They could not force him to forgo the moral principles that he preached. And not because he was a fanatic. Andrey Dmitriyevich was right because he has, he had the secret grasp of the truth and it was revealed to him perhaps more often than others. Today, Andrey Dmitriyevich belongs to immortality. We are trying to travel along the same path which that man traveled. If he had been alongside, there probably would have been less zig-zags, losses, and confusion. But it has become particularly clear now that there is at least one fateful error which we can and must avoid. That is stopping, refusing to move ahead along the aims which he proclaimed—peace, progress, and human rights. I believe that we will succeed in preventing such a mistake which would have tragic consequences.

Thank you for your attention. [applause]

Yeltsin Meets Agricultural Specialists on Crisis

LD2005210991 Moscow TASS in English 1931 GMT 20 May 91

[Text] Moscow May 20 TASS—President of the Russian parliament Boris Yeltsin and republican agricultural specialists, who met here today, discussed how to pull the agri-industrial complex of the Russian Federation out of the present crisis.

Agricultural specialists expressed concern that agriculture turned to be in a difficult situation due to a sharp price hike for industrial goods.

Farmers' cost of living is rising. In addition, the construction of many projects in the countryside and the purchase of agricultural machinery are in jeopardy.

Replying to questions, Yeltsin said that the republican leaders recently took measures to improve the present situation.

A decision, recently signed by Yeltsin and Russian Prime Minister Ivan Silayev, provides for the indexation of prices for agricultural and industrial goods. It is also planned to compensate additional expenses for the countryside caused by higher prices for industrial goods and services.

Yeltsin noted that the Russian Finance Ministry was instructed to appropriate three billion roubles as advance for the agrarian sector during the first six months of this year.

Taking into account the growth in prices not only for Soviet but also for imported equipment for agricultural projects, it is planned to allocate 1.2 billion hard currency roubles to Russian agriculture.

Yeltsin Decree Makes Leningrad Free Economic Zone

LD2005135491 Moscow Radio Moscow World Service in English 1200 GMT 20 May 91

[Text] The head of the Russian parliament, Boris Yeltsin, has signed a decree making Leningrad and the Leningrad region a free economic zone specializing in the development of the services, conversion of some defense industries, and international tourism. Envisaged are easy tax terms for the zone enterprises. They, for example, will be exempt from export and import taxes.

Yeltsin, Ryzhkov on Presidential Election

LD2105085391 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0747 GMT 21 May 91

[Text] Moscow, 21 May (TASS)—In conversation with journalists before the start of the Congress of People's Deputies of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR], Boris Yeltsin, chairman of the Russian Supreme Soviet, expressed the hope that the congress will not go along the road of "endless political debates" and will reach a rapid conclusion. At the same time he noted that the work of the forum may be difficult and that this will be demonstrated, in the main, in discussion of the amendments to the repubic's Constitution in connection with the introduction of the institution of the presidency in Russia.

Boris Yeltsin, who is embarking upon the fight for the post of RSFSR president, told the journalists why he proposed Colonel Aleksandr Rutskoy, a Russian people's deupty who took part in combat in Afghanistan, for the post of vice president.

Rutskoy, in his words, is "a Communist, but not obsessive, not a run-of-the-mill man." At the last congress he put forward the initiative for the creation of the "Communists for Democracy" group and a "very powerful wave" followed after him. Boris Yeltsin said that Rutskoy "has great advantages and I am sure he won't lose me any votes."

Another candidate for Russian president—Nikolay Ryzhkov—was asked before the start of the congress whether he hopes for victory in the elections. He replied: "Yes, of course." "If Boris Gromov and I did not have this hope, there would be no point in our beginning the election campaign and entering the fight in earnest," Ryzkhov said.

Concerning criticism of the former Union Government, the former prime minister said that criticism of his government was only a beginning. Governments have always been criticized and always will be criticized in the future, both the Union Government and republican governments, he said.

Nikolay Ryzhkov regards Boris Yeltsin as a serious opponent who "should not be underestimated." The candidate hopes that the Union treaty will be concluded rapidly. He sees Russia, as well as the Soviet Union, as a federation rather than a confederation.

Commentary Examines Presidential Candidates

LD2005152791 Moscow Radio Moscow World Service in English 1210 GMT 20 May 91

[Vitaliy Gurov commentary]

[Text] The Central Electoral Commission for the election of the Russian Federation's president has completed accepting documents for the registration of candidates to this post. Now the registration of candidates is to take place. Commentary now by Vitaliy Gurov, and this is what he writes:

My colleagues often call an election campaign a marathon, but this time to my mind the marathon is too short. The nomination of candidates to the post of Russia's president began just over a week ago, and just less than four weeks are left to the polling day. If, naturally, some circumstances hinder the elections. [as heard]

So which candidate has the best chance? Of course, just as any forecast, mine may prove wrong, the more so that life in this country often has a supernatural ability for such sudden turns that it's impossible to look far ahead. And yet most experts believe that the number one candidate is the current head of the Russian parliament, Boris Yeltsin. His main traits that have made him popular among the people are an image of a man fighting for justice and often expressing the day-to-day demands of ordinary people. At the same time, Mr. Yeltsin has experience as a political leader who can gather around him close company of most radical and at the same time highly professional specialists. Harsh and uncompromising in recent past, he seems to have become somewhat more farsighted and flexible. His selection of running mate for the vice presidency is an Air Force Colonel Aleksandr Rutskoy, an activist of the new wave in the Soviet Communist Party, who indicates a desire to get the support of critics of the orthodox communist doctrine.

The number two candidate, as it's felt now, is the former Soviet Prime Minister Nikolay Ryzhkov, who left his post late last year largely due to his strong negative attitude to radical economic views. In his election campaign Mr. Ryzhkov remains true to the tactics of gradual reform and to giving priority to the interests of working people. He is strongly opposed to the idea of introducing private ownership of land.

The third major figure on the electoral scene is certainly Vadim Bakatin, a member of the presidential Security Council. Mr. Bakatin is quite a noticeable figure in Soviet politics. Though he joined the top political elite rather recently, he's quickly gained prestige. Small wonder seeing that in the past two years he's been nominated several times as a candidate to senior posts in the Communist Party and state hierarchy. It's certainly a fine point for Vadim Bakatin that he's chosen as his running mate for vice presidency the chairman of the House of Nationalities of the Russian parliament, Ramazan Abdulatipov, a Dargin by nationality. Apparently this figure will help Mr. Bakatin to get support of a considerable number of votes in autonomous units of Russia.

So I won't mention any other candidates to the post of Russia's president, although some of them can get a certain number of votes. But their chance to win the elections is small.

Report on Russian Presidential Candidates

LD2005170591 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak Network in Russian 1300 GMT 20 May 91

[Text] The Russian Central Electoral Commission has just concluded its work. Our legislative correspondent, Vladimir Perfilyev is with us in the studio. Vladimir, what can be said? Tomorrow is the last day for the registration of Russia's candidates for the presidency?

[Perfilyev] No, it has already been concluded today. The Central Electoral Commission has just finished its work. Documents for the registration of candidates for the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] presidency were presented. After examining the documents that were handed in, the Central Electoral Commission made a decision to register candidates for the RSFSR presidency as follows: Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin, chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet; Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov, an all-Union special pensioner and a USSR people's deputy; Vadim Viktorovich Bakatin, member of the USSR Security Council; Albert Mikhaylovich Makashov, commander of the Volga-Ural Military District and also a USSR people's deputy; and Amak-Geldy Moldagazyyevich Tuleyev, chairman of the Kemorrovo Oblast Soviet of People's Deputies and an RSFSR people's deputy.

Candidates for the vice presidency, who were nominated by the contenders for the presidency were also presented there. The following comrades are candidates: Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin proposed for the post of the vice presidency Aleksandr Vladimirovich Rutskoy, a member of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet, a people's deputy of the republic, and hero of the Soviet Union; Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov proposed the candidature of Comrade Boris Vsevolodovich Gromov; Comrade Bakatin proposed the candidature of Comrade Ramazan Gazimuradovich Abdulatipov, chairman of the Soviet of Nationalities of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet; Comrade Makashov put forward Comrade Aleksey Alekseyevich Sergeyev, head of the Department of Political Economy of the Academy of Labor and Social Relations, doctor of economic sciences, and a professor; Comrade Tuleyev proposed for the post of vice president Viktor Ivanovich Bocharov, manager of the combine Kuzbassshakhtostroy, a RSFSR people's deputy, and hero of socialist labor. Three candidates who presented documents for registration as contenders for the post of president of Russia were declined: Ubozhko, Belashov, and Potemkin. They were put forward...[changes thought] I can say that, for example, Comrade Lev Grigorevich Ubozhko was put forward by the Transnational Confederation of the Association of Free Trade Unions. But as it was explained at the sitting of the Central Electoral Commission, the Association of Free Trade Union is registered, but the Transnational Confederation is part and parcel of it and does not have a republican structure. The same applies to the other two candidates.

Therefore, five candidates were registered today. We must remember that we have one other candidate. The regular Fourth Congress of People's Deputies of the RSFSR begins tomorrow and all these candidates will be presented there.

Rutskoy Introduces 'Civic Consensus' Body

LD2005195191 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1304 GMT 20 May 91

[By TASS legislative correspondent Andrey Surzhanskiy]

[Text] Moscow, 20 May (TASS)—The activities of "Civic Consensus," a new public and political organization, are aimed at strengthening Russia's sovereignty as a state, at supporting the republic's present leadership, and consolidating all healthy forces of society. This was stated by Colonel Aleksandr Rutskoy, the movement's leader, member of the republican Supreme Soviet Presidium, and people's deputy, at a press confernce held at the Russian Federation House of Soviets today. The organization was set up at the initiative of the "Communists for Democracy" legislative group, set up at the Third Extraordinary Congress of Russian People's Deputies. Aleksandr Rutskoy came to head the group.

Opening the press conference, he noted that this movement was formed due to the wishes of many grass roots party organizations actively supporting the "Round Table" idea. In the main, Aleksandr Rutskoy emphasized, "they are democratically-minded Communists." Today, said the people's deputy, a false division is being made between the CPSU and democratic movements and the Democratic Russia movement in particular. This is not the case, the speaker stressed. The main division is to be found between democratic forces and totalitarianism, Aleksandr Rutskoy noted. In his words, the Communist Party's democratic forces were defeated at the 28th congress due to a lack of reliance on the grassroots party organizations. Now, he thinks, there are all the chances for an "ideological demarcation between true Communists and those who represent the administrative-command system".

As is known, two days ago, Aleksandr Rutskoy was put forward by the leader of the Russian legislature, Boris Yeltsin, as a candidate for the post of vice president of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic. Replying to a question about his attitude to the fact that Nikolay Ryzhkov, former chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, has been put forward as a candidate for the post of president of Russia, Aleksandr Rutskoy noted that "this man had enough time to show his leadership qualities and his present step appears very strange." As for Nikolay Ryzhkov's choice of Colonel General Boris Gromov, the former commander of the Soviet troops' contingent in Afghanistan, as a candidate for the post of vice president of the republic, Colonel Rutskoy said that "he is a talented military commander, but no way a vice president."

Investigation of Democratic Russia Explosion Cited

LD2005122691 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 1100 GMT 20 May 91

[Text] The investigatory group of the USSR Procuracy, which will look into the explosion at the headquarters of the Democratic Russia Movement, should begin work today. Sergey Adamovich Kovalev, a member of the Presidium of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet, expessed surprise that the investigatory group was beginning work several days after the event.

Igor Kharichev, a representative of the Democratic Russia movement, has categorically denied rumors that the explosion in the headquarters of the movement in Staromonetnyy Lane was organized by members of Democratic Russia themselves. We have lost our headquarters. Material valuables and a file of addresses of cells of Democratic Russia and other organizations in 73 regions of the republic were destroyed.

In the opinion of Igor Kharichev, two noted organizations might be involved in this explosion: the Pamyat Society—or more correctly, one of its groups—or some subunit of the KGB. Kharichev expressed the supposition that such a thing could even happen without the knowledge of KGB Chairman Vladimir Kryuchkov, since structures exist within this organization which are able to act independently. Kharichev called the version about a single maniac improbable and added that the explosion was a blow to Democratic Russia. It was carried out for this reason and was only of benefit to a furious opponent of democracy, a supporter of the harsh course and a strong regime, and a supporter of a return to the past, Igor Kharichev said to a correspondent of the Russian News Information Agency.

Popov Explains Misgivings Over Mayoral Elections

PM2005140791 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 20 May 91 Union Edition p 2

[A. Stepovoy article: "Gavriil Popov Answers Challenge"]

[Text] On the evening of 17 May a letter from G. Popov to Moscow City Soviet deputies was circulated at the Moscow Soviet Press Center. This message is connected with the situation developing over the Moscow mayoral elections scheduled for 12 June.

The letter says, inter alia, that the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet Presidium, in view of the results of a poll of Muscovites, has adopted a decision on the election of the mayor of Moscow. However, a number of Moscow Soviet deputies are actively campaigning against these decisions. They are pressing for the opinion of the majority at an extraordinary Moscow Soviet session to be taken into consideration although these viewpoints may quite well be examined in the process of drafting the RSFSR law on Moscow by the end of 1991. The idea is being put forth that the emergence of a mayor will increase the danger of dictatorship, the Moscow Soviet will become the mayor's appendage deprived of rights, deputies will be left out of things, etc. Yet RSFSR Supreme Soviet Presidium documents have, after all, directly assigned the Moscow Soviet all main normative acts—budget, taxes, prices, etc.

That is why, G. Popov's letter stresses, he is asking deputies to answer two questions by holding a roll-call vote immediately after the Moscow Soviet session begins on 20 May:

—Does the Moscow Soviet accept for execution the RSFSR Supreme Soviet resolution and is it trying to introduce its own amendments during the formulation and implementation of the law on Moscow?

—Does the Moscow Soviet recommend that its chairman G. Popov submit his candidacy for the post of mayor, bearing in mind his statement that, if elected, he will give up his powers as deputy and soviet chairman?

"If the vote on these two questions is in the affirmative, I will agree. If not, I not only will not stand for the post of mayor, but will no longer remain Moscow Soviet chairman."

Discusses Moscow Mayor Issues

LD2005094191 Moscow Russian Television Network in Russian 2015 GMT 19 May 91

[Interview with Gavriil Kharitonovich Popov, chairman of the Moscow City Soviet, by Vladimir Tsvetov—live]

[Text] [Tsvetov] Hello, comrades. First of all, on behalf of the Russian Television and Radio Company, I want to thank the management of the All-Union Television and Radio Company for their efforts which have enabled Gavriil Kharitonovich Popov, chairman of the Moscow City Soviet, to be with us in the studio.

[Popov] I should say that the people of Moscow are accustomed to seeing me on the Moscow channel on Tuesdays. But Comrade Kravchenko recently appointed a new director for the "Good Evening, Moscow" program. It seems no one sufficiently worthy could be found in Moscow, so for Moscow they chose a director from Latvia. True, it was one who was tried and tested in CPSU Central Committee work. The new management informed me that it would no longer be possible for me to appear weekly before the people of Moscow on the Moscow channel. It seems that the "Good Evening, Moscow" program should be renamed "Good Evening, Old Square." Nevertheless, thanks to the kindness of the management of Russian Television—Poptsov, Lysenko and yourself—I have the chance to appear today.

[Tsvetov] The reason for our meeting here today was your open letter to Moscow City Soviet deputies, an open letter you wrote because of the situation taking shape around the elections on 12 June for the mayor of Moscow. What was the situation which led you to put out that letter?

[Popov] As you know, at the same time as the vote there was a poll of Muscovites on the question of electing a mayor. Over 80 percent of Muscovites who took part in the vote favored the election of a mayor. As a result of that poll, the leadership of Russia, the Presidium of Russia's Supreme Soviet, decided a mayor should be elected. They adopted procedures regarding the office of mayor and holding elections.

But those documents are now being subjected to wholesale attacks. The arguments being advanced are as follows: For example, people are saying that, well, a mayor could be elected but now is not the right time, the time is not yet right. It seems to me that we have heard arguments of that kind more than once. When the president of the Soviet Union was being elected it was also the case that a significant number of the documents were not ready, yet, even so, everyone said that everything was ready, because it was a question at that time of the General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee becoming the country's president.

But when it was a question of the election of the president of Russia, there immediately arose talk about one, two, and three things being lacking. For the mayor of Moscow it is the same situation. One thing and another and a third thing is lacking. If, of course, among the mayoral candidates there were in reality a representative of the Moscow city party committee, I am absolutely sure it would be very timely to hold these elections.

[Tsvetov] Gavriil Kharitonovich, there is a doubt prevalent among your opponents. Incidentally, I, too, find it reasonable. It is that other towns in Russia may use the example of Moscow, where we assume that the mayor will possess very broad, full powers. They will also want to introduce the office of mayor themselves. What if, in these towns, in these towns and villages of Russia, this office finds itself held by a person sympathetic, for example, with Pinochet, who as you know, apart from economic reforms, also reorganized the stadiums into concentration camps? Incidentally, sympathy for Pinochet is now frankly and quite frequently being expressed by Communists. So what will happen in that case?

[Popov] What you are saying is a very serious argument. Of course, we could not have failed to study it. Especially, since the fear of dictatorship is more than justified in a country which paid with millions of lives of its citizens for not attending to the problems of dictatorship, because of the euphoria surrounding people's dictatorship. So, when we speak now about strengthening executive power we start from two very important premises. The first premise is that the strengthening of executive power is necessary in order to avoid discrediting our democracy, i.e., order must be introduced in the country, work must be started, real progress must be made on the road to privatization, and so on. Without normally operating power, it is all impossible to do. Entrepreneurs must be protected from racketeers, and citizens from everything else. So, it is for democracy that executive power is necessary, for democracy to prove its capabilities.

The second guarantee is the very mechanism of the elections. Because we elect executive power with people's votes. So, when they say now that the mayor represents a threat of dictatorship, I think they forget what you and I can remember very well. In the morning, we used to open the paper and read that there had been a session, and that Comrade Saykin was elected chairman of Mossovet [Moscow Soviet], of the Mossovet Executive Committee. At that time no one saw any danger of dictatorship in this. But, now that for the first time in all Soviet history the entire population of the city with its own votes will decide who will be mayor, this threatens dictatorship, don't you know. In any mechanism, there are certain dangers and difficulties. But, in the mechanism which we are now introducing, direct elections of the head of executive, of president of Russia, or mayor, in this mechanism, as shown by world experience in all countries, you know that better than I do as you have been in all those countries, this mechanism incorporates all the same enough guarantees for all this to run within the framework of the democratic process.

[Tsvetov] Gavril Kharitonovich, the text of your open letter contains the following lines. You call upon the deputies of the Moscow City Soviet to answer the following qustion and to do so by voting by name: Does the Moscow City Soviet accept the decision of Russia's Supreme Soviet for fulfilment? What do you have in mind? Which decision do you have in mind?

[Popov] Discussion is now taking place, you know, about what is meant by the word mayor. What is it? There are points of view which say that the mayor is an executor. There is the point of view that the mayor means authority, another authority, but authority all the same. Deputy (Bayneko) said on Moscow television that the Moscow City Soviet decides and the mayor carries out the decisions. The mayor is something like the head of a supply department. If they say the light's gone out, screw it up. If they say the street's dirty, sweep it up, etc. Although Deputy (Bayneko) considers himself very far removed from the Communist Party, all of his logic and his reasoning and his style of reasoning are classically Bolshevik. Remember the famous song: The party ordained and the Komsomol replied yes. But if the situation is different, if there is the kind of situation we had during the period of the tobacco crisis, when there were lines in the streets and people were stopping traffic, what should we do? Wait for a session of the Moscow City Soviet which will hold a debate on the issue in question, or should we decide? Or, take the case of the broad crisis last year. Or, even more, last winter when central heating stopped, or when we had other problems.

It seems to me that what is at issue here is the way the issue is understood. When they say one entity decides and another carries out the decision they are not talking about a division of authority. That is a division of the functions in the process of making the decision. Division of authority happens when decisions are shared, both parties make decisions. What division? Let me give you a direct example which I think is obvious. Take the traffic inspector in the street. If a traffic inspector in the street sees someone breaking the traffic rules and stops him and starts telephoning his headquarters asking what he should do, then in less than an hour the city will be blocked with traffic jams. Fortunately for us, the traffic inspector acts differently. What does he do? He takes the rule book. He sees if the rules are being observed or not. Then he makes a decision, to punish, etc. I can appeal against the actions of the traffic inspector. Where? In the courts. But, at the moment in question I have to submit to him. Something similar must happen where the mayor is concerned. The laws by which he operates, the rules, are adopted by the USSR, the Russian legislature and the Moscow City Soviet. But, within the framework of these laws he makes decisions. Why, then, do they not give the mayor of a city the powers that an ordinary traffic inspector has in order to operate?

It seems to me, nevertheless, that this concept of the mayor is the central issue in the dispute, the issue concerning whether the mayor will be able to really do something for the city, or whether a powerless chairman of the Moscow soviet will be replaced by a powerless mayor, with the same results. Of course, the mayor can be wrong, and violate the laws, but that is a matter to be resolved by the court. The courts have the right to decide if the laws are being observed or not. It seems to me that the Russian legislature's approach to the concept of mayor are different. It is the concept adopted by the Russian legislature that is acceptable to me, and that's why I insist that at the session of the Moscow soviet tomorrow deputies express their views, by a named vote, whether they accept the Russian concept or not. I also want them to express their views on me personally. Do they agree to the chairman of the Moscow soviet putting forward his candidacy or not? Depending on these votes, I'll determine my position.

[Tsvetov] Well, apart from that, it probably also has to be taken into account that the Moscow soviet, the session of the Moscow soviet, can manage its mayor very actively by approving or not approving the city budget.

[Popov] You've touched on a very important issue. I think that in the Russian solution the Moscow soviet has been given entirely normal levers. What levers? The budget, the plan, taxes, regulation of property management rules. Given sufficient intelligence and qualification this is more than enough to regulate all of the processes.

[Tsvetov] Gavril Kharitonovich, you have said that you will resign unless deputies vote for execution of the resolution of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet. In this regard, I have one more question for you. Do you have the right, because of the destructive position of several deputies in the Moscow soviet, to resign? Then a person could come to power in Moscow for whom the manual of garrison duties is dearer than the Constitution, and a person who, as we heard quite recently, still doesn't know what common human values are. What is your view on this?

[Popov] You see, I want my point of view to be correctly understood. I am a politician in the democratic movement. I have no other interests apart from this movement. If there is a conflict between me and a democratic Moscow soviet, in which the democrats are in a majority, then in this case you will understand that the entire scenario starts to become reminiscent of the struggle of a person who wants to attain some kind of power. In this case, my decision can only be an unamibigous one: I act as the Moscow soviet decides. But, if there is a different correlation of forces, if, on one side, there is the position of the Moscow Soviet, and on the other the position of democratic forces—the position of the coordinating council of Democratic Russia, the position of the Moscow voters' association, the position of the voters themselves who can come to a city-wide rally tomorrow evening and come to the Moscow soviet and meet deputies—in that case it will for me not be a struggle between the majority of democratic forces defending their democratic principles and the Moscow soviet. Then, there will be a different correlation of forces, and I will take a different view. But, at present, I am bound to reason as the situation has emerged. There is a Moscow soviet, a majority in it belongs to Democratic Russia, and I am bound to act as the Moscow soviet decides.

[Tsvetov] Dear viewers, I don't think it's without interest to the inhabitants, the peoples of Russia, what is going on in the capital of an independent state of Russia. This is why we have invited to our studio Gavriil Kharitonovich Popov. Thank you very much. I wish you success.

Moscow Soviet Refuses Candidacy

LD2005143991 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 1347 GMT 20 May 91

[Text] The fourth session of the Moscow City Soviet is under way in Moscow. In spite of calls from the coordinating council of Democratic Russia and the Moscow Voters Association, the Moscow Soviet deputies have refused to agree to Gavriil Khartinovich Popov's nomination to the post of mayor of Moscow. Their decision is thus at variance with the opinion of almost 200,000 Muscovites who put their signatures in support of nominating the Moscow Soviet chairman to the post of mayor of the capital. Strange as it may seem this decision was made in great measure because of the position of a section of Moscow Soviet deputies who at the election ran precisely on their Democratic Russia Movement ticket. These people have therefore failed to back the program of transformations put forward by Gavriil Kharitonovich Popov. The Democratic Russia Movement appeals to all Muscovites who signed in support of Gavriil Popov's candidacy to come to the Moscow Soviet today at 1800. Today, Moscow Soviet, 1800.

Provisions of RSFSR Land Code Summarized

PM2005151391 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 20 May 91 Union Edition p 1

[I. Abakumov article: "What Will We Get Out of the Land Code"]

[Text] On the evening of 16 May, straight after returning from a trip to Czechoslovakia, Boris Yeltsin, chairman of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet, signed the definitive text of the republic's land code that was adopted back in April by a legislative session. The fundamental law of agrarian reform comes into force as soon as it is published.

The long gap between the code's adoption and its publication was due to the fact that the last legislative session produced so many varying amendments and additions that a lengthy brainstorming session was needed to evaluate them.

Evidently, the code will be criticized by radical specialists in the near future. One of the reasons, for example, is the fact that the document envisages dividing up major farms' land not only among kolkhoz [collective farm] or sovkhoz [state farm] workers but also among medical workers, teachers, librarians, and even pensioners who worked there in the past and live on its territory. This means that a person who wants to leave the kolkhoz and start up a commercial enterprise may lose the chance of obtaining a sizeable parcel of land. That is already happening in Krasnodar Kray where, according to certain data, the average parcel of land per rural inhabitant is dropping to just 1.4 hectares of land or so. That is, one cannot count on a commodity unit. That is one viewpoint.

But there is also another. Medical workers, rural teachers, and pensioners are all entitled to expect a share in the land. Have they not earned some of the common property now being shared out by virtue of their selfless, often virtually unpaid labor?

But the struggle between the ideas that prevail in society, at the Congress of Russian Deputies, and, naturally, at the last legislative session was also reflected here. The rights to one's own parcel of land are considerably limited. It cannot be leased to a neighbor, nor can income be obtained apart from cases where the owner either becomes a helpless invalid or goes on a long duty tour. Even then leasing is only possible subject to the soviet's supervision and consent for a very short period.

If you consider these restrictions not from the viewpoint of our habitual social impatience to obtain everything at a stroke, but from the historical viewpoint, these "impediments" do not seem that terrible. Thinking about it sensibly, one can assume that there are no restrictions that cannot be bypassed by the spirit of free enterprise. Be that as it may, distribution of land creates preconditions for a land market. However, that has always existed, it was just a black market. The code gives it civilized outlines for the first time. The document enshrines the principle of "latency"—the prospect of payment for land use based on land registry evaluation. The relevant law is already being drafted.

Western Republics

Belorussian Strike Deadline Expires 21 May

PM2005135191 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 20 May 91 Union Edition p 2

["Direct Line" report by Nikolay Matukovskiy: "Belorussia's Strike Committees Make Demands"]

[Text] The republic conference of Belorussia's strike committees has worked strenuously for two days—delegates discussed the strike committees' demands for the Supreme Soviet session that opens 21 May.

The debate revolved around a single issue—which problems should be deemed of paramount importance and their immediate resolution demanded, and which should be delayed. Quite unexpectedly, the conference unanimously decided to remove from the agenda demands for increases in wages, pensions, grants, and compensation.

In order to secure fundamentai, truly effective changes in the people's life, it is primarily necessary to change political and state structures and achieve this by constitutional means.

Four of the 12 basic demands have been singled out as the "main," immediate demands. That fulfillment of the declaration on Belorussian state sovereignty be tackled immediately, giving the declaration the status of a constitutional act; all state structures on Belorussian territory be departyized immediately; a resolution be adopted on the inadmissibility of persecuting political strikers; and strike committee representatives be regularly granted 15 minutes' open radio and television airtime.

If the Supreme Soviet session does not include these four demands on the agenda, a general political strike will begin 22 May. If these demands are included on the agenda but are not met in the near future, a strike will begin at the end of May or the beginning of June. Everything now depends on the Belorussian Supreme Soviet.

Minsk Workers Hold Warning Strike

OW2105043591 Moscow INTERFAX in English 0930 GMT 20 May 91

[Text] Automobile workers in Minsk held a one-hour warning strike from 10 to 11 a.m. on Monday (second-shift workers will hold another south action from 6 to 7 p.m. today) to press the demand that the Communist Party and Komsomol (Yang Communist League) cells be removed from the plant's grounds.

Belorussia has been prepared for a republic-wide strike since Saturday, when it was decided that on May 21, the opening day of the Belorussian Supreme Soviet session, representatives of industrial plants would come to Minsk's central square to hand over to the parliamentarians a list of strike committee demands including:

—to pass a law putting the republic in a position to ratify and act issued by the national leadership.

—order the departyization of all government structures on Belorussian territory and remove party committees from the factory grounds;

—grant strike committee representatives 15 minutes of live air time on republican TV and radio daily;

—end the persecution of political strikers and people assisting them.

If the Supreme Soviet refuses to put these demands on the agenda, the Strike Committees Council of Belorussia will order the resumption on May 22 of the political strike held in the republic on April 22-26.

Production Slumps in Belorussia, Measures Cited

LD1705222391 Minsk Domestic Service in Belorussian 0300 GMT 17 May 91

[Commentary by station correspondent Ivan Gradskiy including recorded remarks by Mikhail Vladimirovich Myasnikovich, first deputy chairman of the Belorussian Soviet Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet]

[Text] The road is really difficult. The republic's economy has found itself in a very difficult situation. A sharp slump in production has been taking place, especially lately. While during the three first months of this year production dropped by 3 percent, in April it went down by 5.6 percent. An especially deep slump in industrial prodcution has been allowed by us and the capital's oblast. In general throughout the republic since the beginning of the year, 143.5 million rubles' worth of products have been underproduced. It is also alarming that while production is generally dropping, the enterprises' profits this year have considerably gone up, amounting to 176 percent of the level of the last year's four months.

Agriculture is also facing a lot of problems. The absence of parity in prices on industrial and agricultural goods puts the latter in a very difficult position and threatens a large number of state and collective farms with bankruptcy. As Mikhail Vladimirovich Myasnikovich, first deputy chairman of the Belorussian Soviet Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet, stresses:

[Myasnikovich] The situation today is such that urgent measures of an unusual character are required to stabilize our economy and protect to a maximum all the strata of the population from possible negative consequences.

[Gradskiy] Such measures have been envisaged by the anti-crisis program which is being submitted to the next—the fourth—session of the republic Supreme Soviet opening on 21 May.

[Myasnikovich] The program was prepared by a considerable number of econmic scientists, practical workers, political economists, and financial experts, who work on plans in the Ministry of Finance. Economic calculations, rather serious in my opinion, have been carried out.

[Gradskiy] These calculations show that if urgent measures are not taken, there could be a drop in national income by as much as 20 percent, and in industrial production by as much as 25 percent, which includes a one-third drop in group A and a 22-percent drop in group B. If urgent measures are not taken, money income will drop by 20 percent. The program has been especially designed to prevent this. It envisages, in particular, development, business undertakings, privatization, demonopolization, and the creation of a competitive environment, the development of infrastructure, as well as a number of immediate measures toward the social protection of the population, making working agreements more thorough, and improving management productivity. According to the specialists' calculations, it is possible, in particular, to privatize basic resources in the republic worth approximately 84 bilion rubles, but a third of the resources should remain as state property, while it is envisaged to transfer two thirds to other forms of property. It is also intended to borrow from abroad $1 billion, to increase payment for extra living area 10-fold, cut admittance to higher educational establishments, and to carry out a number of other measures.

The progam is intended for this year and the next one. Putting it forward, the Supreme Soviet and the Council of Ministers of the Belorussian Soviet Socialist Republic call on the Federation of Belorussian Trade Unions, work collectives, on all the political parties, public organizations, and movements for support. Only the consolidation of all the forces, to which the peoples' interests are dear, will make it possible to reach a turning point and to prevent the republic from slipping into chaos and destruction.

Kravchuk Views Problems Facing Union Treaty

LD2005115391 Berlin ADN in German 1007 GMT 20 May 91

[Text] Moscow (ADN)—According to Ukrainian legislative President Leonid Kravchuk, "a very long way" there is still a long way to go before the Soviet Union can conclude a new Union treaty sealing the union of sovereign states. Over the weekend Kravchuk spoke to ADN about the future relations between the central government and the republics of the Union. He stressed the necessity of a Union treaty. A new Union must be created as the old one has proved "absolutely inefficient and and non-viable." All deputies should take part in the formation of the new union of states. They should discuss the draft treaty that has now been proposed, they should work out their suggestions, and adopt appropriate documents.

Kravchuk, who is the head of the republic with the second largest population after Russia, said the demand of Soviet State President Mikhail Gorbachev to conclude the treaty in the near future is "unrealistic." The drawing up and coordination of the treaty with the legislature of the individual republics is a complicated and time-consuming process. The Ukrainian legislature will probably deal with the relevant documents in June. At the moment they are being prepared by the appropriate commissions. It can hardly be expected that the legislature of the nine republics willing to be members of the Union will make identical decisions. Therefore, a second stage will have to follow, where representatives of the republics will work on the final documents. "I think the Union treaty will have to be supplemented by protocols which state the points of view of the republics," he said. "These protocols, which will be law too, will reflect the demands of individual states and contain everything the republics cannot agree to. To adopt a uniform document for all, without these protocols, seems impossible to me." Neither the congress of Soviet People's Deputies nor the Supreme Soviet are entitled to adopt the Union treaty. These bodies do not represent the interests of the peoples. "I think this can only be done by a conference or a congress of representatives," the Ukrainian head of legislature said. Only after such a meeting can the treaty be signed.

The main issues still being debated between the Moscow central government and the republics are, above all, questions of finance, money, taxes, and the co-called Union property. There will be a "big battle" over this. In the Ukraine, for instance, where since last November most consumer goods are only to be had on coupons, there are considerations to support the internal market. There is already talk about a separate currency. "At the moment, however, there is the idea," Kravchuk said, "that special marks could be made on ruble notes, which would then be valid only here in the Ukraine. I think this will happen before the end of the year."

Ukrainian Supreme Soviet Debates Sovereignty Law

LD1805183191 Kiev International Service in Ukrainian 2200 GMT 17 May 91

[Summary] The session of the Ukrainian Supreme Soviet continued its work in Kiev today. The people's deputies had to decide whether the Ukrainian state sovereignty declaration should be given the status of constitutional law. Several deputies expressed their points of view. Attitudes are based on membership in a legislative group. The majority of people's deputies are against including on the agenda the issue of giving the sovereignty declaration the status of a constitutional law.

The deputies examined a draft law on the Ukrainian court of arbitration. It is stressed in the document that the republican court of arbitration will not be subordinate to the Union court. It is planned to be independent of any ideological influence. Dmytro Prytyka, leader of the Ukrainian court of arbitration, says that the institution will oppose any pressure by the Union ministries. The idea of this draft law was approved by the deputies. The draft version will be examined later.

A draft law on pensions was also examined at the plenary session. It is based on the sovereignty declaration. The draft law includes some issues accepted in Western countries. The retirement age was left unchanged at 60 years for men and 55 for women.

The deputies also planned their work for next week. Examination of the issue of the Union treaty was postponed until the beginning of July. It was noted that it is expedient to introduce the institution of presidency only after the constitution has been adopted. For the time being, the chairman of the Supreme Soviet should be given some additional powers so that he can effectively connect activities of the republican government and the Supreme Soviet.

New Ukraine Constitution Discussed

LD1605214891 Kiev International Service in Ukrainian 2200 GMT 14 May 91

[passages within quotation marks are recorded]

[Excerpts] The Ukraine Soviet Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet continued its work in Kiev today. Our legislative correspondents Volodymyr Slipko and Serhiy Hubin report:

[passage omitted] [Slipko] Today, the Constitutional Commission submitted a draft concept of the new principal law of the Ukraine for examination by the full parliament. It was presented by Leonid Kravchuk, chairman of the Supreme Soviet and chairman of the Constitutional Commission. [passage omitted] [Kravchuk] "There were no major divergences in the course of creating a new constitution as a really valuable and stable law. No major divergences arose during the defining of the determinant principals of the constitutional order in the Ukraine. It concerns in particular the issue of recognizing a human being as being of the highest social value; society's supremacy over the state; the supremacy of law, the Constitution, and constitutional laws; the multiparty system; the unity of state power; self-government of the people; and social justice. No misunderstandings arose during the examination of the structure of the new constitution."

[Slipko] [passage omitted: comments on Kravchuk's remarks]

[Kravchuk] "Our Constitution must in the first place put a human being in the center of social reality, and also his or her health, honor, dignity, social and legal protection. In the second place it must strengthen sovereignty of the people in form of representational and direct democracy, and strengthen the idea of sovereignty of the people, the essence of which is that the people, and only the people, are a source of state power, on the constitutional level. And in the third place it must establish the principle of dividing state power into legislative, executive, and judicial."

[Slipko] [passage omitted: Comments on Kravchuk's remarks]

[Kravchuk] [passage omitted] "On the constitutional order of our state: The draft concept envisages a presidential republic, and a classic form of presidential rule is grounded in the system which envisages division of power into legislative, executive, and judicial. According to this idea, the executive power is planned to be strong, authoritative, responsible, and sufficiently independent. A president, the head of executive power, has to be elected directly by the people on the basis of general, equal, and direct suffrage, using a secret ballot. He is given a status of a state person of highest significance. This idea has been approved by the majority in the Constitutional Commission." [passage omitted]

"A president must act only within the limits of his authority, which are fixed by the Constitution, and the Supreme Soviet will have the right to veto his enforceable decrees. In addition it is envisaged that the president will be legally responsible [words indistinct] before the Supreme Soviet, and will bear political responsibility directly before the people. A manifestation of distrust and early termination (?by) authorities in order to [word indistinct] referendum of the people, and so forth. It is also planned that the president will be deprived by the Constitution of the so-called delegated and extraordinary authorities, and constrained in settling financial issues. On his submission, the composition of the Cabinet of Ministers is approved by the Supreme Soviet and will not be [word indistinct] by him individually. And lastly, the president must [word indistinct] permanently cooperate, when settling the most important issues, and report to the legislature annually about the political and socioeconomic situation in the republic."

[Slipko] [passage omitted: comments on issues broached by Kravchuk]

[Hubin] The draft constitution envisages not the reorganization of the government structure separately on the state level, but that of the whole government system of the republic. It equally concerns the Supreme Soviet. It is envisaged that legislature will acquire professional qualities in the prospective, and become a permanently acting one. The speaker noted in this respect.

[Kravchuk] "According to the concept, the Supreme Soviet consists of two houses: the House of the People, to which deputies are elected on the basis of multiparty system for the period of three, well, as a variant for four years, and the House of Representatives, or Senate, from various numbers of deputies from oblast, cities, subordinate to the republican government and the Crimean Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic. The deputies to the House of Representatives are elected for the period of six years from multimandate constituencies." [passage omitted]

[Hubin] The houses of the legislature, according to the draft concept, are granted joint and special authorities. It is envisaged that the House of the People will play a major part in settling legislative and financial issues. The House of Representatives will focus its main attention at appointing the highest officials, granting citizenship, concluding international treaties, and so on. [passage omitted]

[Slipko] Ideas were expressed during the elaboration of the concept as regards the expediency of reorganizing the system of state government bodies in our republic. It was pointed out that the system of Soviets has allegedly exhausted its abilities. The majority in the Constitutional Commission, however, is of different opinion. They think that Soviets were and will remain plenipotentiary representatives of democracy, and retaining them corresponds with principles of a democratic society. Various attitudes, however, both to state government bodies and to local self-governments were laid down in the draft concept. For his part, Kravchuk stressed that he stood for retaining the Soviets at all levels, as they proved themselves to be true mouthpieces of the people's interests over a long period of their existence in our country.

[Hubin] Kravchuk expressed himself unambiguously as regards the system of justice. It was noted that it should be independent of any ideological influence and interference from the state and executive bodies. In addition, the status of the court's independence has to be guaranteed by the Constitution. Presumption of innocence of citizens, their right to legal protection, competition during a trial, and creation of a jury should also be guaranteed in the principal law. [passage omitted]

Ukraine Democratic Press Association Established

LD1805171291 Kiev International Service in Ukrainian 2200 GMT 17 May 91

[Text] The Association of Democratic Press of the Ukraine has been set up in the republic. Our correspondent, Tamara Kucherenko, interviewed (Volodymyr Kuleba) editor of the young people's newspaper KOMSOMOLSKOYE ZNAMYA [KOMSOMOL BANNER], who is one of the organizers and participants of the constituent meeting, which was held in Kiev today.

[Begin recording] [Kucherenko] Does this mean a split in the Ukrainian Union of Journalists?

[(Kuleba)] Absolutely not. We aspire to cooperate with all [word indistinct] unions, inlcuding the USSR Union of Journalists and the Ukrainian Union of Journalists. The association consists mostly of collective members, while the union consists of individual members; therefore, the interests of the two will not conflict.

[Kucherenko] What tasks does the Association of Democratic Press of the Ukraine have?

[(Kuleba)] It is primarily to coordinate the actions of the democratic publications. What do we mean by democratic publications? We mean those publications which, in our view, are guided in their practical activity by the principles of freedom of speech, plurality of ideas, and democratization of society. The Association of Democratic Press of the Ukraine is created to coordinate their actions and also to create the system of social and material protection of editorial collectives and protection of journalists from prosecution for their political convictions. The association will not be a commercial organization, but it may become the founder of a joint-stock company or fund. [end recording]

Moldovan President on National Reconciliation

LD1605111291 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 2010 GMT 15 May 91

[By TASS correspondent Fedor Angeli]

[Text] Kishinvev, 15 May (TASS)—"The issues of national reconciliation can be resolved in Moldova," said president of the republic Mircea Snegur in his closing address today to the Moldovan legislative session. As far as the Gagauz issue is concerned, the president said in particular, this is to be considered later at the session. We have now started to do a great deal to develop the Gagauz and Ukrainian cultures and residents of Jewish nationality are satisfied with our actions. Measures are being planned to develop Russian culture.

Mircea Snegur advocated the introduction of continual conciliation work in the republic to deal with the difficult issues. Among other things, he favors political settlement of the problem of the Dnestr area.

Moldovan Legislators Open Candidacy Discussions

LD2005164491 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0930 GMT 20 May 91

[Text] Kishinev, 20 May (TASS)—Moldovan deputies are today beginning personal discussion of candidates for membership of the legislature. The Moldovan president will propose their candidacies to the Supreme Soviet. According to the MOLDOVA-PRESS agency, the parliamentarians began this procedure at the session of the Moldovan Supreme Soviet which continues its work here. Following adoption last week of the Law "On the Reform of Executive Power," proposed by the republic's president, Mircha Snegur, all executive power is now subordinate to the president.

A keen debate is anticipated over the confiramtion of the candidacy of the Moldovan prime minister. It is known that the Russian-speaking deputies from the "Sovetskaya Moldova" club, Communists from the "Realitatya" [Reality] Club, and agrarian workers (the "Vyatsa Satuluy" Club) have called for the resignation of Premier Mircha Druk.

Moldova Examines Government Structure

LD2005231491 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1318 GMT 20 May 91

[By TASS correspondent Valeriy Demidetskiy]

[Text] Kishinev, 20 May (TASS)—A new structure for the government of the republic was presented to parliament of Moldova today by President Mircha Snegur. In the opinion of deputies, it is hardly different from that already existing, which consists of 16 ministries, a state security committee, and 14 departments. During the discussion, the members of parliament made a number of amendments and additions. However, the president's proposals were endorsed in general. Debates arose only in a few instances. For example, the deputies of Moldova's Supreme Soviet decided to transfer the republic's Ministry of Internal Affairs from Union-republican to republican administration.

Disputes arose also over the department for military affairs, which was recently formed under the Moldovan Government. The formation of this did not gain the support of deputies at the morning session. A reasonable question was asked as to why such a department is necessary when there is a proposal to declare the republic a demilitarized zone. In the opinion of observers, the deputies may still return to examination of this issue.

New Autonomy Proposed in Moldova for Gagazis

OW2105050391 Moscow INTERFAX in English
0930 GMT 20 May 91

[Text] A group of MPs from the southern areas of Moldova circulated in Moldova's parliament the draft of an autonomy for localities populated largely by the Gagauzis. The authors of the document are MP Konstantin Taushanji and Leonid Dobrov, member of the Komrat city council who leads the "Arkalyk" party.

It is presumed that the new autonomy will be called "Gagaz Eri", translated as "Gagauzia", or "The place where Gagauzis live".

According to the document, as an integral part of Moldova, Gagauzia will have political and administrative structures of its own. Its leader, Bashkan, will be elected for 4 years as a result of general elections. His candidacy will be endorsed by Moldova's president.

Gagazia will have to abide by Moldova's laws. However, proceeding from its ethnic specificities, it will be able to liberalize or toughen some articles in Moldova's legislation with the endorsement of Moldova's parliament.

The draft autonomy for localities populated largely by Gagauzis provides for creating there an independent and free economic zone with fixed payments to Moldova's budget.

Caucasus

Gamsakhurdia Interviewed; Assails Shevardnadze

PM2005095991 Vilnius EKHO LITVY in Russian
3 May 91 p 3

[Interview with Z. Gamsakhurdia by A. Kasperunas, representative of the Lithuanian Democratic Labor Party; date, place of interview not given; first two paragraphs are EKHO LITVY introduction: "At Home With Gamsakhurdia"]

[Text] The organization Democratic Congress arranged a peace mission to Georgia. Members of the Lithuanian Democratic Labor Party also participated in it. The mission's aim was to facilitate the forging of contacts between the Georgian and Ossetian sides in the continuing bloody conflict.

During his stay in Georgia Algirdas Kasperunas, the Lithuanian Democratic Labor Party representative, was able to meet with Zviad Gamsakhurdia, chairman of the republic's Supreme Soviet (now president). It is possible that this interview will help to elucidate the views of and the stances occupied by the leader of Georgia's supreme authority, and to better understand the particular steps taken by the Georgian leadership.

[Kasperunas] How do you evaluate the situation in Lithuania? What is Lithuania's place in the processes under way?

[Gamsakhurdia] It has a very important place. Especially as Lithuania is actually the first to break loose from the empire. It is even already establishing diplomatic contacts. Lithuania is beginning to be recognized, and this encourages us all greatly. After Lithuania, recognition will come to other republics as well.

We admire the Lithuanian people's heroism, and we are striving to support them in all possible ways. During the tragic events of January a well-attended rally in support of the Lithuanian people took place here in Tbilisi. Georgian and Lithuanian flags flew side by side. Moreover, we sent food and other basic necessities to Lithuania on several occasions.

In this difficult struggle for independence you have gone further than us because the West supports you more. The West doesn't know us at all. To be more precise, it does know us now, but not at all well.

[Kasperunas] This support does not seem so significant to us.

[Gamsakhurdia] But what about Denmark? And Iceland?

[Kasperunas] Certain progress can be seen, but matters go no further than declarations and exchanges of delegations. While on the subject of international matters, how did your meeting with Secretary of State J. Baker go?

[Gamsakhurdia] This was the first time a representative of the U.S. Administration had invited republic leaders. The Kyrgyz president and the Armenian prime minister attended the meeting. Then the secretary of state met with the president of Kazakhstan. We are hoping that this is the beginning of direct contacts with the republics, bypassing the "center."

[Kasperunas] Just recently you have often expressed a fairly harsh opinion of E. Shevardnadze. For example, at the meeting with representatives of the Democratic Congress his name was mentioned in connection with the actions of the armed militants in Georgia....

[Gamsakhurdia] He is the shadiest of personalities, an ally of Gorbachev, but plays at being a democrat in order to fool the West. In actual fact he is the cruelest enemy of both Lithuania and Georgia, of all peoples who strive for independence. You should not fool yourselves as far as he's concerned.

[Kasperunas] But all over the world he's considered to be....

[Gamsakhurdia] He has such a reputation because he's created such an image for himself. In actual fact he represents a very dangerous figure.

[Kasperunas] Why, then, do you think he submitted his resignation?

[Gamsakhurdia] He didn't. He was forced to, in order to placate the military. The military is very angry with him.

[Kasperunas] You mean, he is not so "right-wing" as the military?

[Gamsakhurdia] No, they are simply using him for their own ends. He is a regular "left-winger," but he is simply a puppet. As they decide to use him, so he acts.

[Kasperunas] If we meet in six months' time, will the situation be better or worse? Or maybe, it won't change?

[Gamsakhurdia] I think it will be better. The days of the empire are drawing to a close.

[Kasperunas] All over the Union the economic crisis is getting worse. Will it not call forth a dictatorship? After all, in a certain section of society the demand for a "firm hand" is great. Do you not consider the scenario of military dictatorship a possibility?

[Gamsakhurdia] I don't think so. This would sink the economy once and for all. "They" would hardly venture to do this.

Girenko Visits S. Ossetia, Holds Talks

PM2005142791 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
20 May 91 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Stay in Caucasus"]

[Text] Vladikavkaz, 19 May—A.N. Girenko, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, visited the North Ossetian Soviet Socialist Republic, the Chechen-Ingush Republic, and the South Ossetian Autonomous Oblast 16 through 19 May. First he made a trip to South Ossetia. During meetings with working people in the oblast, which is part of the Republic of Georgia, attention was focused on ways to resolve interethnic problems in the region and on questions of eliminating as quickly as possible the aftermath of the destructive earthquake in Dzhavskiy Rayon.

The CPSU Central Committee secretary expressed condolences at the deaths of the oblast's inhabitants during the earthquake.

During his stay in North Ossetia A.N. Girenko chatted with representatives of multinational labor collectives. Attention was devoted to complex problems of the renewal of society under conditions of forming the new Union treaty.

In the Chechen-Ingush Republic the Central Committee secretary participated in the work of the party and economic aktiv.

Ter-Petrosyan: Gorbachev Not Keeping His Word

PM2005154891 Madrid DIARIO 16 in Spanish
17 May 91 p 20

[Interview with Armenian President Levon Ter-Petrosyan by Carlos Enrique Bayo in Yerevan; date not given]

[Excerpt] [Passage omitted] [Bayo] Do you believe that the Kremlin is capable of a large-scale war to prevent Armenia's independence?

[Ter-Petrosyan] No, because Gorbachev has already tried military means unsuccessfully in Vilnius. What he is attempting is to cause the democratic authorities to fall, and to this end he is using every form of pressures, attacks, and economic blockades in the hope that the Armenian people, no longer able to endure so many misfortunes, will rise up against their government. His problem is that in Armenia he has no political force to support those actions, since the Communists form a tiny minority.

[Bayo] What did Gorbachev tell you in the Kremlin?

[Ter-Petrosyan] He did not even mention our independence process, since he confines himself to vague diplomatic language, but it is clear that everything that is happening, including the latest military actions against the population of Karabakh, form part of a plan of his against our self-determination. He promised me that the Armenians would not be deported from their villages, but shortly afterward the military razed Getashen and Martunashen to the ground, leaving them uninhabited. He promised me that the military actions would cease, and then Paravakar was shelled. Now a second stage against Nagorno-Karabakh is beginning, arresting all the men in order force their families to flee. Gorbachev is not keeping his word.

[Bayo] What is the solution to the Nagorno-Karabakh problem?

[Ter-Petrosyan] I have been proposing for eight months, both to Gorbachev and to (Azerbaijani President) Mutalibov that complete autonomy for the region be restored, while still keeping it within Azerbaijan—something that would be acceptable both to Moscow and to Baku—but they do not even accept that. This shows that Gorbachev wants the Karabakh conflict to remain alive and bleeding in order to be able to interfere in the area through the Azerbaijani Government, which is the last Communist bastion in the Caucasus.

[Bayo] Are you negotiating with the military?

[Ter-Petrosyan] I speak directly only with KGB chief Kryuchkov, because it is the KGB which coordinates the operations of the the army and the Interior Ministry against Armenia. Kryuchkov has even admitted to me that atrocities have been committed against the Armenians, but 1,000 paratroopers have arrived in Yerevan, 108 Armenians have been taken hostage (it cannot be said that they are being detained, because none of them was a guerrilla), and the women and children are being forced to sign documents certifying their voluntary deportation.

[Bayo] And what is the Armenian KGB doing?

[Ter-Petrosyan] Although it is still formally under Moscow's authority, its members (we have replaced many officers) are loyal to Armenia and are working for its interests, but the USSR KGB removed all its records from Armenia in 1989 (they are now in Smolensk), and that paralyzes us since they contain vital information on our society, our economy, and our past.

[Bayo] What will you do if the army occupies your headquarters?

[Ter-Petrosyan] We will not resist. It is impossible for us to resist the Soviet Army, and we will have to continue to adopt a political course and to appeal for international solidarity. The Western states never remember Armenia, but they are watching Gorbachev's actions and pressing him not to use force—not with respect to Armenia but in general. That is our only chance. We cannot even help our brothers in Karabakh except by sending them food and medicines. At least, let them not die of hunger, even if the army attacks continue.

[Bayo] And if they do continue?

[Ter-Petrosyan] In that case, a time could come when we will no longer be able to control our people, and the whole nation will rise up against the aggressor. Everything that is written about the Armenian fedayin is exaggerated—they are very few in number and poorly armed—but, even so, nobody will deflect us from our path to independence: a path which we will follow by constitutional means, and by those alone, even though Gorbachev may try to provoke bloody incidents in order to be able to accuse us of breaching the Constitution.

[Bayo] Whom do you trust within the USSR?

[Ter-Petrosyan] I have lost all hope in Gorbachev. Moreover, he has achieved nothing through his perestroyka, and Yeltsin is now a much more real political force than the president. But I trust not individuals but the republics: especially Russia and the Ukraine, which are taking the overall economic and social decisions into their own hands, without the center being able to do anything. Russia, the Ukraine, and Belorussia have approved parliamentary resolutions forbidding the army's intervention in the resolution of the ethnic conflicts. My only desire is for those decisions reflecting the Soviet people's real wishes to be carried out.

Armenian Supreme Soviet Appeals on Deportees

NC2105094591 Yerevan Radio Yerevan Network in Armenian 1730 GMT 20 May 91

["The Appeal Made by the Armenian Republic's Supreme Soviet Presidium to the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium and to the Presidiums of the Supreme Soviets of the Union and Autonomous Republic"—radio headline]

[Text] Following the massacres and forced deportation of the Armenian population of Getashen and Martunashen and the large-scale punitive operations carried out by the Soviet Army in Armenia's regions bordering Azerbaijan, the atrocities and crimes have now spread to Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast [NKAO].

Using passport control as a pretext, the Azerbaijani Special Purpose Militia Detachment—supported by the Soviet Army and the Internal Troop subunits of the USSR Internal Affairs Ministry—has unleashed a new wave of terrorism on and forced deportations from the oblast. These acts are accompanied by plunder, rape, and murder of peaceful citizens. Almost all of the male population in the Armenian villages in the oblast are being detained and taken to Azerbaijan. The women, children, and elderly are being humiliated and ridiculed.

The peaceful population from 15 villages in Gadrutskiy Rayon and Berdadzor subrayon in the NKAO were (?deported) from their permanent residences on May 16. More than 1,000 beaten, plundered, and terrorized people—most of whom are women, children, and elderly—are in the temporary camps set up near Khndzoresk and Tekh villages in Gorisskiy Rayon close to the border between Azerbaijan and Armenia.

Despite their many promises the high-level Soviet leadership and Army command made to return them to their permanent residences and to ensure their security, the Soviet leadership has virtually taken no practical step in this direction. Moreover, the representatives of the Soviet leadership have not even visited the location to get acquainted with the situation.

We request that you send representatives to the NKAO and to Armenia's border regions in order to obstruct the plan to solve the Nagorno-Karabakh problem by upsetting its demographic balance, to get firsthand information about the disastrous condition of the deportees, to take all available measures to secure the return of the deportees to their homes, and to prevent further atrocities against the Armenian people.

Television Shows Events in Nagorno-Karabakh

LD1905001391

[Editorial Report] Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian at 0600 GMT on 16 May, in the "Television News Service" program, carries a six-minute report by V.A. Yanachenkov, captioned as "chief of the OVSMI [expansion unknown] of the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs." Standing in a mountainous landscape, he says that "here in Nagorno-Karabakh" there has been hatred and mutual mistrust for some time between the Armenian and Azerbaijani populations. "Unlawful actions are carried out on both sides. Armed militants carry out attacks on civilian settlements and villages, and even on details of Internal Troops and details of the Soviet Army."

Yanchenkov says this has resulted in "yet another major operation" by Internal Troops to fulfill the presidential decree on eliminating illegal armed formations and seizing illegally held weapons.

Soldiers are shown forming beside armored personnel carriers and trucks, which are then shown travelling along a road. Men are shown entering a helicopter, and there is an aerial view through open helicopter doors. Yanchenkov says: "The task facing the Internal Troops of the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs and units of the Soviet Army is to stop the excesses of illegal armed formations and bandit groups, which in a literal sense are terrorizing the Armenian and Azerbaijani populations in Nagorno-Karabakh and adjoining areas. The first hours of an operation to disarm illegal armed formations are under way. The first clashes with armed militants are taking place. Without entering into an open fight, they are firing on the positions of elements of Internal Troops and their combat hardware, and are carrying out sorties against civilian settlements." The video shows multiple rocket launchers and trucks in a field, a tank overlooking a village, and soldiers looking out over an embankment.

At a border post at the "workers' settlement" of Gagi Captain Vokulchuk a battalion commander, explains how his men came to be supporting active units of Internal Troops. Pointing to a hillside, he says that in the morning a group of Internal Troops had been carrying out an operation to "neutralize" gangs of armed militants from the Armenian side While proceeding up a road in darkness, the group was stopped by fire coming from a concealed position. Return fire had failed to work, and "heavy artillery" had to be used. The column was held up another three or four times because of machine gun fire from ravines and caves. Grenade launchers were used. Vokulchuk concludes by saying the "mission was accomplished." video shows more shots of multiple rocket launchers.

Over video of a column of military vehicles on the move at night, with tracers streaking across the sky, Yanchenkov notes this is not taking place abroad, but in the Soviet Union. "According to certain Armenian officials," Yanchenkov continues, the village of Shurnukh in Gorisskiy Rayon was "devastated and looted by the Internal Troops on 7 may." Video said by Yanchenkov to have been shot on 9 May shows the village from the air. "As you can see, the settlement is intact. Just one single building was destroyed as a result of the operation." Yanchenkov says: "It housed the headquarters of an armed detachment called the Bat."

A soldier describes how, on 7 May, the men came under fire at the village from antitank grenades. (?AMOR) militants, known among the local residents as "the Bat," had their headquarters in the damaged building. The AMOR men directed automatic fire at the men. Grenades, TNT, and other weapons were seized. During the taking of the armed militants and their headquarters, there was "intensive" fire from the militants.

The video shows weapons and ammunition seized in the headquarters. Yanchenkov says that to date 162 firearms have been seized from illegal formations, including over 130 rifles. Another 22 hail control weapons and surface-to-air devices, two mortars, four pieces of armored equipment, and 29 vehicles were destroyed or seized. Around 150 persons from the "armed resistance" have been detained. All the incidents are being investigated.

The video closes with members of the Internal Troops being feted at the Azerbaijani rayon center of Kubatly after "accomplishing their mission and bringing peace and order to the residents of the rayon center, for the time being."

Central Asia

Russia's Silayev on Ties With Kazakhstan

LD2005090591 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 1900 GMT 19 May 91

[Text] Ivan Silayev, Russia's prime minister, is currently in the capital of Kazakhstan. Our correspondent Yevgeniy Zavedomkov told us over the telephone about the progress of Ivan Silayev's visit to Alma-Ata, and what is more, he invited the chairman of the Russian Council of Ministers to the telephone. Let's hear this recording.

[Begin recording] [Zavedomskov] Ivan Stepanovich's trip to Kazakhstan is a working visit, during which a number of important issues connected with the implementation of the economic agreement for 1991 signed between our republics are to be discussed. This concerns first and foremost issues of reciprocal supplies, of trade exchange. Well, Kazakhstan is interested most in supplies of Russian timber, while for Russia, it is supplies of grain. Well, taking into account the new conditions for settlement of accounts that the republics are going over to, no few problems arise here. Ivan Stepanovich, we have become accustomed to the fact that for many long years, ties between republics were handled via the center. Now the first such bilateral ties are being established. well, how much more complicated is it, how much more complicated is it to cooperate via these bilateral ties, and what problems come up here, and, well, what issues would you like to discuss here in Kazakhstan?

[Silayev] Last year, for the first time many Union republics, including Russia and Kazakhstan, signed economic agreements. These mean direct relations on a mutually beneficial basis. Well, one can say that there are complications, one can say that there are difficulties, since everything new is always difficult, but we can already see the high effectiveness of the first year, when we know who is in who's debt, or on the contrary, who, let's say, of the participating partners in the direct ties structures, is not completing the work on something. We reckon that the start that has been made by the special agreements (?on economic cooperation last year) means new prospects [word indistinct] elements of market relations. [end recording]

Kazakh Deputies Criticize Government Policies

LD1605182591 Moscow All-Union Radio First Program Radio-1 Network in Russian 1400 GMT 16 May 91

[Text] An open letter criticizing the policy of their government has been sent to the president of Kazakhstan and the republican prime ministers by a group of peoples deputies of the Kazakh Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR]. Instead of a specific program for stabilizing the economy and transfering to the market, the letter says, the Cabinet of Ministers has proposed a generalized document which does not match up to the real situation, and which, to a large extent, is incapable of being implemented. Among the reasons for the crisis economic situation in Kazakhstan, the people's representatives list the slowness in forming the government, in which the obsolete Council of Ministers has been preserved; and the failure of the Cabinet of Ministers to fulfill virtually all the instructions from the Supreme Soviet of the Kazakh SSR aimed at implementing laws which have already been adopted. In connection with this, the group proposes a range of practical measures it believes to be capable of speeding up radical changes in the republic.

CPSU's Shenin Tours Uzbekistan 15-18 May

PM1705092591 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 17 May 91 Second Edition p 2

[Correspondent V. Artemenko report: "Stay in Uzbekistan"]

[Text] Tashkent, 16 May—O.S. Shenin, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, arrived in Uzbekistan 15 May. He visited the "Malika" and "Zenit" Production Associations in Tashkent. During his numerous meetings with Communists, workers, and employees, the secretary of the CPSU Central Committee inquired about the pace of work at enterprises and asked about output quality and reciprocal deliveries. Particular attention was devoted to social and consumer problems.

O.S. Shenin visited the mining settlement of Dzhigaristan in Akhangaranskiy Rayon, where there was a landslide in early May, resulting in 54 people being buried alive. The secretary of the CPSU Central Committee expressed his condolences about the disaster, talked with residents of the settlement, and visited the site where work has already started on the construction of 50 homes.

O.S. Shenin was accompanied during his meetings with working people by I.A. Karimov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, first secretary of the Uzbek Communist Party Central Committee, and Uzbek president.

Uzbek Policies 'Inspire Confidence'

LD1905083491 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1907 GMT 18 May 91

[Text] Moscow, 18 May (TASS)—Oleg Shenin, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and member of the Politburo, was in Uzbekistan from 15 to 18 May. He was familiarized with the life of the republic, the activities of the Uzbek Communist Party, and party organizations in the localities. He was interested in immediate and long-term plans connected with the resolution of the tasks of the social protection of the population in the period of the economy's entry into market relations and of strengthening the influence of the party organizations on processes which become involved in sociopolitical and socioeconomic life.

On 18 May O. Shenin spoke at a meeting with the party aktiv of the republic and Tashkent Oblast. I. Karimov, member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee, first secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Uzbekistan, and president of the republic, also spoke at the meeting.

It was noted that the firmness, dynamism, and consistency of the policies conducted by the Communist Party of Uzbekistan inspire confidence—the difficulties existing will be surmounted. The good mood of the workers and striving to get out of the crisis situation more quickly as a result of the social and political stabilization in Uzbekistan. Democracy is incompatible with anarchy, glasnost with the spontaneity of street politics, pluralism with disorder and lack of discipline, it was stressed at the meeting.

The party committees and party organizations of Uzbekistan determined where to apply their forces to resolve a set of urgent issues. In particular, these are strong social policies that give the people confidence in the future.